The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XXX • APRIL, 1944 • NUMBER 2

TOWARD BETTER COMMUNICATION IN 1944, AND AFTER*

LENNOX GREY
Columbia University

WITH your permission I should like to give over the first half of my time to some wishes and yearnings that are in the air in teacher education institutions and schools alike, and the second half to some of the tough-minded resolutions that seem to be called for.

We need our forward look on three levels at least: first, the larger statesmanship for the schools; second, the prospect for the colleges; third, the preparation of professional workers to carry statesmanship, including that from the colleges, into the schools. As I think of our threefold approach, a shifting image runs through my mind, changing shape yet keeping certain constant qualities and colors. It is prompted by a Christmas card from a young engineer-draftsman friend—an expressively luminous blueprint of wishes for the year ahead. It suggests other writings on blue that have forecast value. One is the persuasive word of the skywriter drawn on the infinite blue, a linking of economics, science, and art. The other is the white vapor trail of the big bomber on the deeper blue of the stratosphere. I shall leave it to you which is the bomber, which the skywriter, which the blueprinter. I daresay we have each been identified with all three, statospheric, evanescent, and wishfully luminous, not always in a complimentary sense.

These, at any rate, are some of the wishes—drawn with hopeful white on the infinite blue—each accompanied by a few cautioning questions to keep our hopes from soaring too high.

(1) First, of course, we are wishing that we shall soon win this war, that before long we may be educating for a peace in which we shall not have to kill other men in order to survive and to work out our ideals. But do we believe that peace lies just around the corner? Not many of us. Nor do we believe that when it comes it will be a rosy-fingered dawn. How can we believe that the problems will be any less heavy than those facing us now—especially without our present singleness of purpose in winning the war?

(2) So, as sequel to the first wish, we wish for increasing strength to carry on our wartime tasks, knowing that we shall probably grow more and more shorthanded in the schools, and that we shall

* Presented at the War Problems Conference of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH (28th Annual Meeting) at The Commodore, New York City, December 28, 1943. A general discussion by members of the ASSOCIATION followed, and was thus summarized by C. M. Wise of Louisiana State University: "This meeting can be history in the making. It may not even be second in importance to the meeting of thirty years ago at which this ASSOCIATION was founded, for this meeting may be even of greater importance. . . . After this discussion let us devise some means by which we can sit together and work out a plan of cooperation between teachers of speech and English by which we can work together instead of continuing separately and too often in competition." ED.

probably have to do more and more emergency preparation and remedial preparation in our schools and in our teacher education institutions. Since we know, too, that while our armed forces are growing better and better trained and equipped our schools are taking on teachers with less and less training, and have less and less equipment and money to give them—can we move in a glow of optimism?

(3) And so, not being wholly optimistic about the immediate tomorrow, we wish for the strength and vision particularly to plan an elementary education, secondary education, and higher education for the longer tomorrow that will be equal to the demand of increased economic and political problems—to the demands of a more intricate technology—to the demands of developing sciences and arts—all of which will outmode much of our present practice and knowledge within the next generation. But is this something we can really plan for? Or must we make an at-best unhappy choice between the semi-obsolete categories of yesterday and some vague formless intuitive "emerging" curriculum that may never emerge?

(4) Hence we must wish always, for better and better teacher-material equal to the demands, and better status for the teacher to attract the best material. We have some reason for hope here; we sense that many good minds are seeing satisfactions in teaching not offered in traditionally more lucrative and popular fields. Yet can we doubt that the status of teaching may become worse before it becomes better? Will the untrained teachers now coming to relieve the short handedness in our schools improve our status? Won't many of the less able "emergency" teachers stick to their posts like cockleburrs in a collie's coat after the war? Won't many of them come to teacher training institutions, to convert emergency licenses into permanent licenses in perfunctory fashion—hard to kindle with the highest professional zeal that must be our aim?

(5) And then—we wish always, first and finally, for eagerer boys and girls in our schools. The war has given significant motives for youth. But do these motives make for studious eagerness? And will the emergency teachers increase their enthusiasm?—either for a general education program or for a vocational program?

II

No, even our most hopeful wishing on these points cannot make the immediate prospect for the educated teacher or for teacher education bright—except in the significance of the service that is called for. Accordingly it calls for stouter and stouter resolution, directed at the points of greatest need and greatest promise, selected on the basis of sober thought rather than of whim or short-range ambition.

These, then, are some of the resolutions most needed, as I see them, equal to the midnight zeal of the draftsman, the calculated skill of the skywriter, and the common resolve of the bomber crew.

We need common resolve—

(1) That, in the spirit of unity which we are recommending to the rest of the world, we seek unity in education in America. Now, if ever, teachers need to come together—elementary school, high school and college teachers—liberal arts teachers, and professional educators. The sniping that goes on between the liberal arts colleges and the professional schools of education is as shameful as the sniping between the Mihailovich and Tito factions in Yugoslavia, or as the factionalism that brought about the fall of France. It can have as serious consequences for education, at a time when democratic education is more seriously threatened than most of us realize.

(2) That we base this quest for unity on something that all of us can subscribe to as essential—leaving matters of special advantage to less critical times. This must include the way as well as the ultimate goal. We can agree on "democracy" and "International Fellowship." But what way can we agree on?

(3) That once the resolution is made and the way is marked out, we allow nothing to distract us from it—neither the surrender of Germany, as a half-way mark, nor Presidential campaigns, nor the lure of the open road when we can drive automobiles again—unless they are ways to it.

(4) That we select that part of the task for which we are best fitted, and work at it coordinately with others—not allowing our energies to be dissipated in random gestures.

III

For nearly two years now some of us here have been testing the several essentials, to see the best practical ways for reaching the democratic goal. We have found one that seems to hold common challenges to student teachers and experienced teachers alike, to school administrators and workers in government agencies, to high-school and college administrators, to the educational staffs of Army and Navy, and not least of all to the parents and taxpayers who are very conscious that they are paying the bills.

That is the growing realization *that communication is the basis of all human community—the basic factor in all education, in all human relations, in all national union, in world federation.* Democracy, we are coming to see, depends on democratic communication. We are becoming aware that the war was due to the failure of communication among some peoples, and the exploiting of new instruments and techniques by others. We sense that we shall escape the bitterest of race and class conflicts in America and throughout the world only if we can establish communication and common understanding. We can achieve this only if we have an understanding of communication arts and processes beyond anything most of us now possess—particularly, as a very practical step, we must see to it that revolutionary new instruments of communication are used to further human understanding, not to exploit human ignorance. Most of us admit we know all too little about these communication processes, and that we know next to nothing about the newer instruments, though we may be skilled in discussing the playing of *Hamlet* or the technique of a novel of Dickens'. We have thought all too little about the crucial bearing of all this on the future of nations and races. But we are beginning to think.

We are beginning to realize for the first time that new instruments of communication, radio, and television, make possible a world community, within instantaneous reach of one man's voice, for good or ill. Hitler and his Nazis saw the chance to establish a new community, a New World Order, of slaves, using new instruments and techniques of communication linked with new instruments of transportation. We hate to think how narrow our escape has been. But we are pulling our heads out of the sand and are beginning to think about it just the same.

IV

There are several ways of testing the unifying power of such an educational idea. One is by a kind of Gallup poll. More than a year ago some of us devoted some months to a less publicized form of testing. The results were far better than we had dreamed. And the evidence has been piling up ever since, as I shall show you later.

But there are more immediate ways of testing—here and now. Let me put this question to you: Can teachers of speech and teachers of English agree on this communication idea and what it implies for the educational program? Can they agree on a few illustrative particulars?

I need not tell you that there have been differences of opinion and rivalries between teachers of speech and teachers of English. But am I right in thinking that we can find common cause in a comprehensive communication program, for wartime service and continuing community service after the war? Would we agree further that there is more than enough work for all of us, and that we can work most effectively if we support one another—and if we extend that mutual support to include all the communication arts and services—music, fine arts, graphics, radio, motion picture, language studies, library services.

If we say *yes*, despite all the differences of interest that have divided us in times past, then that is sufficient test on the first point. I think we may even see some of our differences resolved by the communication we establish among ourselves. While I speak only for myself in this, I can readily imagine the National Council of Teachers of English making the following recommendation: *That every small high school have at least one teacher primarily trained in speech and every large high school a considerable number; that every English teacher have some basic training in speech—at least enough to know when not to tamper with a deeply rooted speech problem; and so on, according to the best advice* of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH. *Similarly, I can imagine the teachers of speech supporting with enthusiasm a program in reading, writing, listening and speaking designed to give experience with similarities and differences in written and spoken idiom.*

Within such a common idea I can even imagine teachers of English and speech admitting that we have probably carried complete independence far enough. Both groups may have gained strength by trying their strength separately. The question now is whether, like the English speaking peoples of the world, they will find some means of alliance to exert common pressure for the improvement of democratic communication.

It is said to be easy to generalize thus. What if we particularize? Would we agree that *discussion*, democratic discussion, is an important form of communication for all our classes—and that generally our schools do it badly? Could we improve this procedure if we joined forces to improve it in our classes? Could we foster it further in an Office of School Information and Communication, in which all the communication arts should take part? Could we foster it in our staff meetings? Should we establish it as one of several school wide aims? If our school is venturesome could it be part of the Communication unit in a core or general studies program? I think the answer to all these questions is *yes*.

V

I hope your response to this brief test is favorable. For if it is, you will find that it can take form in something more than pious words—though many thoughtful words will be required. For your officers, in cooperation with the officers of the National Council of Teachers of English, and of nine other communication arts groups have been laying careful plans throughout the past year which will result in vigorous action if you approve. These plans imply a program of in-service education beyond anything heretofore proposed.

A year ago, at the suggestion of two

or three of our teaching groups, the United States Office of Education invited representatives of speech, English, dramatics, radio education, music, fine arts, graphics, audio-visual aids, OWI, OCD, and the Army to meet in Washington to discuss ways of mobilizing our educational resources for improved wartime communication service and continuing community service after the war.

The response was unanimously enthusiastic. Out of that meeting and subsequent meetings, expanded to include library services and foreign languages, have come two major developments:

One will be the issuing in January or February of a substantial companion to the original Victory Corps manual of the United States Office of Education which will be entitled *The Communication Arts and the High School Victory Corps.* It contains sections with recommendations from each of the teaching groups represented, along with over-all administrative recommendations for coordinating our communication resources in schools and communities.

The second is the plan, sponsored by the National Education Association, the United States Office of Education and a national Communication Arts steering committee made up of representatives of the groups contributing to the Communication Arts manual to hold simultaneous conferences in as many as 300 centers all over the country, in the coming spring or fall, to demonstrate the services of communication arts to the war effort and postwar planning. The National Education Association has provided funds for $2,500 for a director and staff to carry on the administrative plans. The Association for Education by Radio has plans for national radio hookup to link the various meetings. Others have other contributing proposals. And at the August conference plans were made for a cooperative membership drive that should add to the strength and effectiveness of each of the participating organizations.

Those are the major developments.

Coordinated with them are other projects of other groups. As a sample let me describe those of the National Council of Teachers of English, which you can match with your own, and with others in art, music, and the rest.

In the December 1 issue of *Education for Victory* appeared an extensive summary of the pre-induction English manual prepared by the Pre-Induction Training Branch of the War Department, the United States Office of Education, and the National Council of Teachers of English. It is entitled *Pre-Induction Needs in Language Communication and Reading.* Representatives of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH were consulted about the substantial sections devoted to speaking, and I think you will be pleased by them.

The United States Treasury Department and the Office of Price Administration have both prepared bulletins for English teachers to be widely distributed next month, I believe, stressing the comprehensive communication function of English teachers in coordination with other Communication Arts teachers. And the Treasury Department's bulletin *Schools at War* carried a description of the plans for coordinated service by the Communication Arts groups.

In January or February also the National Council of Teachers of English will bring out the first of a series of NCTE pamphlets on Communication entitled *What Communication Means Today.* It will be followed by a pamphlet, now in hand in manuscript entitled *Skill in Speaking,* prepared by a committee of your ASSOCIATION under the chairmanship of Professor Magdalene Kramer. It will be a joint publication of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF

Teachers of Speech and the National Council of Teachers of English, and will, I hope, symbolize a new day of cooperation. *Skill in Speaking* will be accompanied by other pamphlets on *Skill in Listening, Skill in Writing, Skill in Reading*, and these will be followed before June by pamphlets on *Junior High School English in Wartime and After, Communication Among Nations, Movies in Wartime*. The manuscripts of all these are completed or practically completed. It will be largely a question of printing schedules.

Matching these with work of other associations, we clearly have something in this accent on communication that many groups and agencies have been able to come together on. At the University of Chicago, at Teachers College, at Stanford, at Stephens College and elsewhere there are programs of Studies in Communication Arts designed to serve in the preparation of teachers and in the informing of young people generally about the resources and problems of communication which we must master as citizens in America and citizens of the world.

May we hope and resolve, then, that this starting momentum will increase, both in war and in peace. At the high school level this communication arts concept can give us a unifying force as strong as that of the Humanities concept on the college level—perhaps stronger because it is directed at the citizenship training function of the high school, rather than at the more elusive philosophic-esthetic concept which gives integrity to the college Humanities.

Few of us deny that we need in the high schools a concept that will unify the arts as the social studies and sciences are unified. We know also that we need in the high schools and in our teacher education programs a type of unification that will link rather than separate the broad fields—for the divisions of Humanities, Social Studies, and Sciences have been too often separated in the colleges. The Communication Arts can do it, if we will have it so. And they will permit a flexibility of teaching pattern ranging from the standard specialized pattern to the correlated general studies and core programs.

So, in conclusion, this is what I would inscribe on the hopeful New Year's card, luminous white on darkling blue:

To a tough year in teacher education—
but a good one if we will have it so.

THE TELEVISION OUTLOOK

JOHN T. WILLIAMS
Television Department, National Broadcasting Company

TELEVISION as a public service in the United States became a fact on April 30, 1939, when Television Station WNBT, New York, owned and operated by the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., carried as its first program President Franklin D. Roosevelt's address opening the New York World's Fair.

Much work and thought on television, by technicians, had been necessary prior to this program. One of the elements formerly used in television, selenium, was isolated in 1817. Its reaction to light was noticed first in 1873 by a telegraph operator named May, who lived in Southern Ireland. He discovered that

selenium's resistance to the flow of electric current decreased as the intensity of light falling on its surface increased. With this discovery, it became apparent that an image could be translated into electrical impulses. Maurice Leblanc, a Frenchman, laid down in 1880 the basic principle whereby the picture image became a series of electrical impulses. This technique was called "scanning," a word still in good television usage. Paul Nipkow, a German, in 1884 perfected a mechanical scanning disc which became a basic television technique though it has been refined many times. Karl Brown, around 1900, developed the cathode-ray tube which is in its refined state the picture reproducing "kinescope" in today's television receiver. Mechanical scanning continued to hold forth in television circles until 1929 with Boris Rosing, A. A. Campbell-Swinton, Dr. Lee de Forest, C. F. Jenkins, John L. Baird, and others contributing to television's development.

II

The Radio Corporation of America entered the television broadcasting field in 1928. Dr. Vladimir K. Zworykin joined the RCA staff in 1930, and continued his previous experiments in television. He further experimented with mechanical scanning devices, and decided this system was impractical for home use. Dr. Zworykin eventually perfected an electronic scanning system which he announced in 1933. It is this electronic system which is now the basis of the television transmission technique.

Following the first public service broadcast in April, 1939, the National Broadcasting Company continued with programs until August, 1940, at which time operations were suspended. Certain technical changes required by the Federal Communications Commission were incorporated in the system, and programming began again in October, 1940, to continue each week until June 30, 1941.

On July 1, 1941, Station WNBT began operating under a commercial license, and has been on the air at least one day per week since. From July 1, 1941, until June, 1942, the programs were broadcast six days per week for a weekly average of fifteen or more hours. Since June, 1942, the WNBT schedule has been a minimum of four hours per week. With the other New York City television stations on the air, the New York area now has a program service each evening except Saturday. The program period covers about two hours each evening.

Other television stations have been in operation for several years. These early pioneers are:

WRGB—Schenectady
WCBW—New York City
WPTZ—Philadelphia
W2XWV—New York City
W9XZV—Chicago
W9XBK—Chicago
W6XYZ—Los Angeles
W6XAO—Los Angeles

III

From the foregoing, one can readily understand that the television technique has been in operation over a considerable period. The 5000-odd set owners in the New York City area will attest to the entertainment and educational value of television as will set owners in the service areas of the other stations mentioned above.

Those closely associated with television know that it currently offers a limited service that can be expanded as rapidly as materials and manpower are freed from the war effort. Nor is there any doubt that the quality and quantity of the program service will be increased.

Past experience has shown no limitation to the type programs that can be

used for program material. Dramas, variety programs, religious events, education, sports of all types, spot news, public events, and a host of other subjects are all within the range of the television camera. Their acceptance by the public as good programming varies with the audience, and with the ability of the producer to make his subject interesting.

One of Station WNBT's recent features has been a series of lectures for the New York City Air Warden Service. These programs, for more than a year, were the basic training courses for all air wardens, and were required before any warden could progress further in the service. During the period from October 4, 1943, to December 27, 1943, a new series for "fire guard" training was broadcast in conjunction with the New York City Police Department to replace the Air Warden series. Through television, with the aid of a centralized and standardized lecture course, all of New York City's wardens got the same training—undiluted by varied individual opinions.

For many months there has been in operation a small network of television stations pointing the way to future development of this feature of the service. Station WRGB, Schenectady, New York, has consistently broadcast programs originating at Station WNBT, New York City. In addition, Station WPTZ, Philadelphia, has rebroadcast these programs, but their use of the service has been limited in the past few months.

Currently, WPTZ is rebroadcasting from New York most of the field programs originating from Madison Square Garden. Station WRGB in Schenectady accomplishes these rebroadcasts through the use of one relay station which picks up the WNBT signal (a distance of 129 miles), amplifies it, and boosts it on to their main transmitter. Station WPTZ in Philadelphia gets the WNBT signal directly from New York without the use of a relay, a distance of eighty-odd miles.

IV

Relay stations are necessary for network broadcasting because of the nature of the television signal impulse which generally is projected from the station antenna to any point on or within the optical horizon. Future developments of the television network will require enough relay stations to bridge the distance between any two transmitters. The need will vary with the terrain, but as a general rule, the distance between relays will be approximately 25 to 30 miles.

The first postwar television network will likely link Boston, Washington, and the intervening cities with New York City as the main program origination point.

The ability of American industry to produce consumer goods in quantity leaves no doubt that television receivers will be manufactured at a price level within the range of the average consumer's ability to pay. Already several thousand sets have been produced and sold that are operating satisfactorily after several years of use.

Color television is *not* developed to a degree where it is now ready for the home receiver. The present "black and white" picture is satisfactory. Projection of the television image on theatre screens is already an accomplished fact. Home size receivers with the image projected on a screen approximately 18 x 24 inches have also been demonstrated. However, an image approximately 9 x 12 inches, the average set size, when viewed from a distance of six feet, gives about the same aspect ratio as that of the motion picture screen in a large theatre when one sits near the rear of the house. It seems obvious that the size screen on the home receiver will depend upon the individual's home need.

V

Educational institutions will need access to television equipment if they are to train their students in this medium. Practical contact with the actual physical television plant, by those individuals interested in television from the standpoint of program direction and talent, will be necessary if they intend to know television's peculiarities and master its problems.

There are two approaches to this problem. One is the installation of a complete television transmission station at the university through which the program department of the station can offer its television audience a complete program schedule. The alternate procedure would be to install only that portion of the television equipment, a "workshop unit," necessary for the program material to be translated into the television image and projected on suitable receiver and monitoring screens (kinescopes) for criticism by instructors and students.

The latter plan would require at least two cameras, control units, monitoring screens, and the related technical equipment for the "video" side of television; and the microphone, monitoring speaker, and related technical material for the "audio" portion.

No equipment for either type installation has been built for many months, making it difficult to predict the cost of either of such installations. However, a reasonable figure, based on pre-war experience, would indicate $75,000 as an approximate cost of a complete television broadcast station exclusive of necessary studios, buildings and the installation expenses. To set up the "workshop" type of equipment would require an expenditure of approximately $25,000 to $40,000 exclusive of installation costs and the necessary physical studio. These cost figures should not be construed as final for postwar production problems and costs cannot be foreseen or predicted accurately.

Little will be added to the television program technique by the school which does not have available the necessary equipment to make possible an opportunity for instructors and students to view, criticize and correct their presentations as they actually appear, projected on the television screen.

VI

The war effort is the main reason television has been dormant for the past two years. Nor is there likely to be any expansion of the service until the war ends, or the end is in sight. Commercial television has been a reality for more than two years. The service can be expanded rapidly when the "go-ahead" signal is given. The television industry generally is ready and anxious for that day.

VII

Mr. Niles Trammell, president of the National Broadcasting Company, in his recent testimony before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee in connection with the White-Wheeler Radio bill hearings, stated in part:

> Television, of course, offers the greatest challenge to our ingenuity and enterprise. Here the scientist has provided eyes for the blind radio. While we have erected a great broadcasting service utilizing sound alone, we are today where the motion picture industry was twenty years ago when voice came to the silent screen. A technical revolution is imminent, awaiting only the conclusion of the war. The broadcast industry in time must scrap its entire plant and build a new one, thus providing employment for men and money. This new service will revolutionize far flung lines of human activity. It will affect every field of education, information, entertainment, advertising and selling, mass production and distribution.
>
> . . . The questions that arise in these respects bear upon the fundamental philosophy of radio legislation in determining whether radio will be made to creep or will be allowed

to walk in postwar development. For example, present FCC regulations have already imposed a strait-jacket on the creation of television networks by prohibiting the ownership of more than three television stations by any one company.

Mr. Trammell also declared that:

Freedom to advance in the radio art demands that those who have developed broadcasting, who have established transmitters, studios and services, be given the opportunity to modernize their facilities to keep pace with scientific and technical progress. The broadcast station or network which is not permitted to transform itself into a sight and sound service will go the way of the silent film or the horse and buggy.

The future points to a television receiver in most homes having electric service. The programs will cover a wide variety of subjects with entertainment type programs comprising the major portion of the schedules just as in standard radio. Americans like to be entertained, and television will take the public to a wealth of places many have never seen.

TELEVISION AND DEPARTMENTS OF SPEECH

ROSS SCANLAN
The College of the City of New York

TODAY, television broadcasting for civilians must mark time. The war has drawn heavily on trained personnel and has absorbed all equipment as quickly as it could be produced. However, the large commercial radio companies have not abandoned civilian television. With the small available personnel, with a frank use of the most economical programs possible, and by carefully nursing the equipment at hand, the companies are making every effort to keep up at least the framework of a public television broadcasting system.

There is good reason for these efforts, and it lies in the conviction—one may say the certainty—that when the war is over, television broadcasting will enter a period of rapid and considerable expansion. Until Pearl Harbor, experience had proved one thing: that television had an important future. True, many problems remained unsolved and are still unsolved, but no one regards them as permanently incapable of solution. When civilian television once more gets the green light, we can reasonably expect advances in such directions as a substantial decrease in the cost of broadcasting equipment and receiving sets, the simplification and improvement of operating procedures, the extension of broadcasting areas by the establishment of an adequate and practical system of relays, the development of a basis of revenue sufficient to support the expense of television with reasonable profit to the enterprise, a refinement in the types and quality of programs, and finally, the evolution of techniques of presentation or production suited to the very special requirements of television. All in all, a large order, but one that can be filled under normal conditions.

II

The prospects for television will naturally excite the interest of teachers of speech. As far back as 1939, at least three colleges had obtained licenses for television broadcasting: the University of Iowa, Purdue University, and Kansas State College. Perhaps there have been others. In any case, the war likely headed

off some applications that will come in when peace returns, and it seems certain that every college that has been offering courses in sound broadcasting will give, or already has given, serious consideration to similar work in television.

Yet, even with the assurance of an important future, television as a whole is still in a highly experimental stage. The greatest advances have been made, naturally, in the mechanics of television. Such advances have been prerequisite to the problems of program, production, and finance. Moreover, the war may not have retarded technical progress as much as might appear; military and naval use of television and of related agents may bring developments which can later be employed in the civilian industry and which will greatly accelerate its general expansion.

What will be of interest to speech departments is the fact that, although much was learned from broadcasting before Pearl Harbor, the fundamental problems having to do with programs and production still invite the labors of the pioneer. *Basic determinations about the kinds of program, the form of the script, the style of movement, the timing of speech and movement, and the form of setting most effective in television—each of these has yet to go through considerable experimental evolution. After the war, any speech department with access to the necessary equipment can take part in working out these problems. In the general domain of the speech arts, it is a pioneering opportunity almost without parallel since the days of Corax and Tisias.*

III

The challenge to the experimental impulse arises not alone from the fact that television is still an infant industry with much to learn. It comes particularly from the fact that television must develop its own techniques. Experienced managers and directors agree that, whatever television may borrow from sound broadcasting, from motion pictures, and from the theatre, the forms fully suited to television must be radically different from those of radio, screen, and stage.

Every type of program to be presented by television will need its own form. In ordinary news broadcasts over sound radio, for example, the commentator sits or stands in front of a microphone and reads from his script for the specified length of the program, a procedure that probably would not have any enduring visual attraction for television audiences. In the motion picture theatres the audience, listening to the news commentator, watches up-to-the-minute news films that are the fruits of an extensive and costly organization. It is not likely that radio companies will go to the tremendous expense of setting up parallel organizations to provide them with films of current events. Still less likely is it that the latest motion picture films, prepared for use in the theatres, will be available on any terms to the television broadcasters. In short, for its news broadcast television, like the newsreel, must provide visual interest, but without the resources of the newsreel to do it. That will require experiment and ingenuity.

In what radio calls on-the-spot broadcasts—those covering sports events, etc., from the scene of action (and a form of program that will be popular in television)—the commentator again will have a more difficult and exacting task than does his colleague in radio. The sound broadcaster at a sports event must be able to improvise and to impart enthusiasm to his description of the action, but it is no trade secret that, since he talks to a blind audience, his inventiveness and excitement sometimes transcend that of the event itself. Apparently, in radio this

does no great harm, and there are persons who would rather listen to a sports event than see it. But the television audience is not blind. Cameras enough to cover the action thoroughly are also on hand to report the story—a fact that will hold the television commentator to a high standard of accuracy.

IV

His problem suggests another fundamental peculiarity of television. Producers and directors agree that television listeners will make up the most critical audience a public performer ever confronted. Because they can see as well as hear, the spectators will be more critical of a television performance than they have ever been of sound broadcasting. Many of the startling simplifications and deceptions, which one appreciates only when he witnesses a sound broadcast in the studio, will not be possible in television. On the other hand, the critical sensibilities of the television spectator are not affected, as they may be in the legitimate theatre or in the motion picture theatre, by susceptibility to architecture, ornament, or the contagious moods of crowds. The television spectator will be in his own familiar living-room, which takes away much of the sense of a special occasion. He will be alone or with the members of his own family, and he will be looking at a comparatively small mirror. More than ever before the show will have to stand on its own merits.

Television programs will rely heavily upon dramatic entertainment; and here particularly must specially adapted procedures be worked out in every division of the production. First, the script must be so contrived that it will fit the peculiar limitations of television. It cannot follow the pattern of motion picture scenarios, partly because a television studio cannot accommodate as many settings as a motion picture studio, or as much time for the actors to get from one set to another. Probably, through sheer necessity, dramatic writers for television will become disciples of the unities of time, place, and action. And, in still another way, they may adapt to modern purposes a practice of the ancients: that is, in the use of very few characters in any one scene. This restriction is forced upon them by the severe limitation of floor space for the setting, by limitations in the effective range of the television camera, and, more particularly, by the comparatively small size of the receiving mirror which makes the crowd effects of the motion picture virtually impossible. In a random collection of still-pictures of shows produced by the National Broadcasting Company there were eight scenes with only two characters in each, to one with three and one with four. An argument by sign, perhaps, but it seems enough to indicate a practice that must be followed by the script writers.

V

Television will call for a new technique of acting and an unusually high degree of perfection in it. There will be no chance for retakes as in the motion pictures, and little or none of the opportunity to cover up mishaps which the stage sometimes affords. The television actor cannot read his lines from a script as the radio actor does, nor, being fairly close to a highly sensitive microphone, can he rely, as stage actors occasionally do, upon the emergency services of a prompter in the wings. He will have very little space in which to play, because he must keep within fixed distances of the cameras, and because the set is not very large as it is. Yet, he must perform with movement and pantomime. In short, he has none of the margin for error and very little of the physical scope enjoyed by actors of radio.

screen, or stage. Because of the unusual physical conditions under which he works, his art must be unique both in form and in the skill which he brings to it.

In the same way, pioneering remains to be done in the evolution of settings for television plays. The area of a television set will be much smaller than that of the average stage and still less than that of the motion picture. Moreover, different sets used in the same play must be ingeniously placed to fit into a single studio and to permit the actors to get quickly from one to another. Design, dimensions, lighting, and color must be specially adapted to radio transmission. Even the technique of make-up cannot be borrowed without adaptation from the stage or from the screen.

All divisions of the production call for trained operators whose field is specifically television. Experience in radio, motion pictures, or theatre may help, but it will also give the television worker much to forget. The script writer will have to learn a basically new form which is neither legitimate drama, picture scenario, nor radio script; and he will have to learn the form through television experience itself. The television actor will have to learn a fundamentally distinct mode of acting; and he will have to learn it in the television studio. Indeed, television must establish its own corps of actors, for unlike sound broadcasting, it cannot borrow the services of a stage or screen actor who can get ready to go on with an hour or two of rehearsal sometime before the performance. Finally, for reasons already discussed, television will need its own staff of scene designers and technicians.

VI

Without leaving the boundaries of academic sobriety, one may say that in all this there is excitement and promise and good work to be done. Certainly it is not too much to expect that after the war some of our colleges will find an opportunity to share in the development of television and in training the personnel that television will need. Up to the present, the cost of equipment has been high and the area served by a single station small, but this has not deterred some institutions from making a beginning, and it is to be hoped that technical and financial obstacles will diminish when the time comes to resume normal broadcasting operations.

THE PROSPECT FOR SPEECH EDUCATION*

ROBERT WEST
University of Wisconsin

CAN any one of you doubt that America is now at the point at which the struggle of arms must share, and eventually yield, the stage to the struggle of words, and that words from America will have an important part in deciding the fate of generations to come throughout the world? Do any of you doubt that in this struggle the spoken will be more effective a weapon than the printed word? As an authority here let me quote from a famous book. The author writes, "I know that one is able to win people far more by the spoken than by the written word." Please remember

* The President's address at the War Problems Conference of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH (28th Annual Meeting) at The Commodore, New York City, December 28, 1943.

that quotation, for I shall refer to it again. Suffice it here to say that this man apparently would agree with at least one of the important tenets of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH—that the tongue is mightier than the pen.

The American way of life embraces many principles. One of them is the principle of making available to *all* the knowledge, skill and discoveries of the few. It has been assumed that we will progress farther along the way toward a good life for all if we openly patent our inventions rather than hold them secret; or if we train others in the skill we possess rather than restrict such skills to the few; or, again, if we spread our knowledge as widely as possible rather than hold it for a small, intellectual aristocracy. Such has been the assumption. But suppose that today you happened upon the discovery of a death-ray that could be employed to destroy rats, insects, bacteria and all harmful living organisms, but which could also be employed to destroy men. Would you share your discovery with the world? Some of you would destroy your formula, and leave us still plagued by varmints rather than risk letting our enemies, present or future, have such a terrible weapon. But others would give the discovery to the allied governments. No one in his right mind would now share the discovery with the entire world. Not in wartime, you say! If not in wartime, why then in peacetime? Who can say there may not be another war? If such a ray were discovered, it should be the closely guarded secret of those who can be trusted to employ it only for humanitarian purposes.

Now it has been assumed by many of us that it would be a measure of political and social health if we spread as widely as possible the knowledge concerning, and inculcated in as many as possible of our youth, the skills of public speaking and group discussion. Is this assumption any more valid than the assumption that we should share our death-ray with the world? Is the formula for public speaking less likely to be used for evil purposes than that for the ray? Both are tools that may be used for great good or for great evil, depending upon who uses them. If, then, we really believe that we can train young people to speak more effectively than they could without training, we should consider the responsibility we take when we accept for such training any and every student, regardless of what purpose he may have when he employs the technique we have taught him. The quotation I made above—viz., "I know that one is able to win people far more by the spoken than by the written word," was, I must here confess, not in the exact words of the author. I am sure that I have done no violence, however, to his intended meaning. In elaboration of his idea he said again, "For let it be said to all knights of the pen and to all political dandies especially of today: the greatest changes in this world have never been brought about by a goose quill. No, the pen has been reserved to motivate these changes theoretically. But the power which set sliding the greatest historical avalanches of political and religious nature was, from the beginning of time, the magic force of the spoken word alone." Again, they are not the exact words of the author—because the exact words would not be easily intelligible to many of you. The original text was in German and the author a man whose name in all probability has been uttered more frequently, in the contexts of more languages, by more of his contemporaries, than that of any other man in the history of the world. I am quoting from a book called *Mein Kampf*. The author glorifies the "magic force of the spoken word" as "die Zauberkraft des gesprochnen

Wortes." Training or no training, Adolf Hitler wrought a good share of the damage of his *Kampf* by his public speaking. It would be a terrible death ray that could do more damage than did his speaking before audiences of German citizens.

II

Believing, therefore, in the effectiveness of our teaching of speech techniques, I seriously propose that we all attempt to pick our disciples as carefully as did Jesus of Nazareth. We must not, of course, use as a basis of selection the criteria of religious creed, ethnic background, or political philosophy. I propose that, instead, we consider the following standards, encouraging all students who qualify under these heads, and discouraging in every legal way all who fall short.

1. *First criterion.* In his contact with others who are engaged in molding public opinion the modern public speaker should be cooperative. The world is growing too small and our interests are too interlocked to make room for the independent tongue responsible *only* to the conscience of its possessor. The student who gives promise of unbridled individualism must be denied the right to learn from us the art of public speaking. We must encourage the student who is willing to play on a team.

2. *Second criterion.* In addition to being cooperative, the modern public speaker should be willing to put his audience ahead of himself in importance. The audience should be flood-lighted, instead of the speaker's being spot-lighted. The speaker should not be egocentric; instead, to coin a word on the lines of our figure above, the speaker should be alteradiant. Those students who seem to us to enjoy too much the greeting, *Heil*, should be discouraged. Those students who have an abiding interest in understanding and expressing the needs of others should be encouraged.

3. *Third criterion.* In addition to being cooperative and alteradiant, the modern speaker must in his purposes be sane, emotionally stable, well-balanced, not a fanatic, zealot, or monomaniac. The speaker whose insanity never progresses far enough to land him in the hospital is far more dangerous than those who have clearly demonstrable delusions. The student who seems to live in this psychiatric borderland should be discouraged from continuing in public speaking; and the student who seems sane should be encouraged. Perhaps the best sign of sanity is a sense of humor.

4. *Fourth criterion.* In addition to being cooperative, alteradiant, and sane, the modern public speaker should be open-minded and inquisitive as to subject matter. He must enjoy testing his ideas by comparison with those of others. He should realize that, not since the days of Aristotle has the body of organized human knowledge been small enough to be encompassed by the mind of one man, and that today no one man can know all that is known about even one special topic. The student who scorns to find out what others think is a dangerous disciple to train; only those students should be encouraged in public speaking whose intellectual curiosity about a given subject increases with their discussion of it.

5. *Fifth criterion.* The public speaker of use to us in this modern world must be honest in his motives and decisions. Compromising the truth as the speaker sees it can build only the most transient of social and political structures. Dishonesty should disqualify the student from receiving the help of teachers of speech. Honesty, especially when it militates against the personal interests of the student, should be one of the most important marks of a person worthy to re-

ceive your help in learning to talk to others.

These, then, are the five criteria. The worthy student is cooperative, alteradiant, sane, inquisitive, and honest.

III

Now I have spoken largely about the worthy student of public speaking and public discussion, rather than the student of drama and interpretation. Our criteria are equally applicable to these students, but the danger of training the unworthy student in these fields is not as great as in the training of those students who may build social and political structures, or destroy them.

Some may fear that it will be difficult to appraise these qualities that I have mentioned. It is difficult to discover dishonesty in a student; and the adherence to a political creed different from that of the teacher may be mistaken for insanity. True! But that should not prevent us from making the attempt to apply our criteria. It is difficult to be sure of a given candidate to the freshman class of a university whether he is college material, but we apply our tests nevertheless.

The teacher of public speaking, moreover, by the nature of the activity in which the student is engaging is in a peculiarly fine position to size up the student in the qualities desired. Most of us, I am sure, are already applying these tests and are encouraging the students who possess them. What I am urging is a more drastic discouragement, or even rejection, of those who lack them. That is the forward step that we must take in these days when radio is pushing the press off the forensic stage. Hitler sees the point and sees to it that his people will get only the radio voice of the Nazi machine. We must see it, too, and we must do what we can to limit the numbers of those who are trained for the radio to those who can be trusted to build safe public opinion.

Ask your medical school if only brains and skill are required of a prospective physician? Dishonest lawyers are not admitted to the bar, no matter how clever or versed in the law. The Army and Navy, both in peace and war, reject candidates for officer ranks for reasons of character, quite apart from military skill and knowledge. Why do these professions protect themselves? Because they serve the public in vital ways. My contention is that never before in the history of the world, was the fate of the public more dependent upon any one group of trained men and women that it is now dependent upon public speakers. We cannot dodge our responsibility by saying, "My job is to train students, not select them." If *we* do not select them, no one else will. We are the persons standing at the gates of the profession of public speaking. Many persons get in by going around the gates; but that does not excuse any laxity in our guardianship of the portal. Our leadership will fail if we neglect our responsibility and if consequently some future Hitler should arise who can say, "I got my training in public speaking at Wisconsin, or Michigan, or Cornell, or Wabash." And when such an American Hitler is finally destroyed, his alma mater will share tragically in his destruction and will inherit from him the odium of public disapproval.

Mind you, I have no fear for the ultimate triumph of truth over error under a system in which any one and everyone is permitted his say. My fear is for those whose life span happens to fall within the period when error is temporarily master of the field. I believe the time has come when teachers of speech can help in making the fight a fair one so that truth will prevail more frequently and the millennium will come the sooner.

THE ARMY AND ITS NEEDS IN SPEECH

HAROLD W. KENT
Major, Infantry, Pre-Induction Training Headquarters, Army Service Forces

THE ultimate objective of all military training is to assure victory in the event of war. Certain skills in military training have come to be accepted as common needs for every soldier and consequently may be stated as helpful areas of study for prospective inductees. For example, he must know why he is fighting. He must know the mathematics essential to training and combat. He should be superbly equipped in body and be competent in the basic elements of oral and written communication. In line with the theme of this paper the reader is reminded that careful and continuing attention is paid to the communication skills in all training installations in the Army.

In amplifying and interpreting Army needs in the speech field it is necessary, first to present a number of quotations and references to provide an appropriate background for the discussion that follows. Then it will be helpful to summarize the Army's reactions to the manner of speech performance as encountered with the Army, and lastly, to state five phases of Army speech training which comprise actual Army needs.

I

The Army does not make any suggestions to school people in the shape of outlines, courses of study or possible intrusive units in courses of study. Such implementation has been adequately supplied through a report appearing in the December 1 issue of *Education for Victory*[1] and in a recently released United States Office of Education manual, *Communication Arts and the High School Victory Corps.*[2] For further assistance the reader is referred to the Pre-Induction Training Branch officers in the Nine Service Commands. They are available for consultation and interpretation in these matters upon request.

The Army places terrific stress upon leadership. A chief element of good leadership is the ability to speak before others clearly and with confidence. An officer or noncommissioned officer under strain in battle maintains the morale of his men and adds to their effectiveness through the confidence and conviction inspired by his voice. The Army Special Service Division[3] has expressed itself on this point.

> It is obvious that in any Army, leadership is essential, both in training and in operations in the field. The leadership of which men in an Army are most aware is that afforded by company officers and non-commissioned officers . . . he [the officer] has an obligation not merely to instruct and direct his men but also to constitute himself the leader and to some extent the director of their thinking. Therefore, the development of an ability to talk effectively in simple soldier language is definitely at a premium, whether the subject matter involved is instruction in map reading, the technical use of a weapon, or the discussion of an item in the news related to the war in a manner to stimulate men's thoughts. In all such connections, clear, forceful and sincere expression and practice in speaking to small groups has peculiar value. . . .

This matter of leadership, however, is not confined to those who stand in front or up on top. Leadership may be found in the rank of private, first class. Does

[1] *Education for Victory*, published by U. S. Office of Education; bi-weekly.

[2] *Communication Arts and the H. S. Victory Corps;* U. S. Office of Education, January, 1944.

[3] From a letter dated 23 July, 1943, signed by Rankin R. Boone, Lt. Colonel, Infantry, for the Director, Special Service Division.

he have those inner disciplines—the habits of work, of orderly thinking, of *clear, vigorous expression* developed to the point where he can lead himself—then he, too, is in very real essence a leader. Everyone in the Army from bottomside to topside should strive for sharp clarity and an orderly process of mind in making oral presentation; the radio operator in a tank, the walkie-talkie expert, the officer in charge of an Army landing barge, the orderly reporting at the message center, the liaison between commands and combat, the instructor at one o'clock in the afternoon reading the Articles of War, the sentry repeating his general and special orders. These and a multitude of other situations substantiate the necessity for achieving sharp clarity and an orderly process of mind.

Let's see then what is in the record. From Colonel Wheat, Professor in the Department of English, U. S. Military Academy, West Point:[4] "Training at West Point in public speaking is not limited to the English course alone. Approximately 25 per cent of the cadet's recitations in other subjects are in the nature of public speaking." *The Officers' Guide*[5] puts it this way:

> The Army officer who can speak before an audience with clarity and logic possesses an art which will always serve him well. . . . Unless oral instruction is presented with good public-speaking technique, interest succumbs to boredom, understanding is replaced by confusion, and potentially good soldiers are discouraged in their natural zeal to learn. It is not inaccurate to regard the commander of a troop unit as a teacher. His men must be taught before he can truly "command." Practical public-speaking ability is essential for the military leader who is charged with training troops.
>
> It can be stated with confidence that the government does not expect all of its military officers to become orators of distinction just as it cannot hope that each will develop the leadership qualities of a Pershing, a Lee, a Grant, or a Washington. . . . The Army has no pressing need for great orators, nor has it any need whatever for spellbinders and rabble-rousers. But it has a great need for officers who have knowledge, logical conclusions based upon it, and ability to impart it to others. The Army needs clear-thinking, clear-speaking, "garden variety" teachers and instructors who will become the commanders, after the training period is completed, of the military units our nation requires.

Military Training Manual 21-5[6] puts it in another way:

> To make an effective speech the speaker must be sure of what he says, sure of its soundness and sure of its clearness and coherence. The military speaker is concerned chiefly with holding the interest of his audience and of transmitting his ideas clearly in simple words. . . . There are certain fundamental qualities of address which every speech should have: A sense of communication; physical vitality; enthusiasm; poise and control; genuineness and earnestness . . . with these qualities, a speech may succeed in spite of poor voice, poor gesture, and poor English.

In the matter of developing a sense of communication, the manual suggests that "the speaker must think as he progresses, speak slowly, feel the idea as well as think it and then make an effort to adapt himself to the audience."

In the matter of physical vitality, "Strong and positive tone of speech, forceful enunciation, strong position, and vigorous gesture count for much." As for enthusiasm, "In practicing delivery, the speaker tries to generate the same enthusiasm as for the final speech." In poise and control, ". . . with all his force and enthusiasm, he must not fly off the handle; he must be master of himself; he must always keep himself in hand." The matter of genuineness and earnestness ". . . he must believe what he says . . . a sense of humor is one of the greatest assets to the speaker and is

[4] Letter of December 4, 1932, to Louis A. Mallory, Brooklyn College.

[5] *The Officers' Guide*, 4th Edition: The Military Service Publishing Co., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, p. 335.

[6] War Department Basic Field Manual, *Military Training FM 21-5*, July 16, 1941.

evidenced by his manner as well as by his words."

From *Training Manual 21-250*[7] we find the statements that:

A. The instructor is . . . [to be] . . . heard.—The instructor's voice is his best teaching weapon. . . . Factors in a good speaking voice [are]:

First: Voice quality.—Each instructor has an individual voice quality which it is his duty to make pleasant to his listeners.

Second: Volume of voice.—The lecturer should speak loudly enough for every man to hear him, but he should raise his voice beyond that point only for emphasis. . . .

Third: Rate of speaking.—Frequent changes in rate of speaking are as important as change in volume. . . .

Fourth: Pauses.—. . . should be definite and planned. Clean breaks bring variety and interest . . . pauses should punctuate, not mutilate. . . .

Fifth: Enunciation.—The instructor should enunciate each word as definitely and smartly as he gives a salute. He must avoid slurring, swallowing, or mumbling. . . .

Last: Naturalness.—Don't "orate"! Don't shout! Don't whisper! . . .

B. . . . the instructor is to be understood. . . .

First: [By] choice of words—The right word in the right place is the keynote of effective speech. Verbal communication depends on using those words which have the exact shade of meaning needed to make the thought clear. The instructor should use—

(1) Short words. . . .

(2) Familiar words. . . .

(3) Concrete words and phrases. . . .

Second: [Through] sentence structure.—Sentences should be constructed as carefully as words are chosen. The words should fit into their places as neatly as the utensils in the soldiers' mess kits. The instructor should—

(1) Use short sentences. . . .

(2) Vary the form of sentences. . . .

(3) Provide transitions from one sentence to the next. . . .

The Army Air Forces has a guide, *Public Speaking Guide for Instructors*,[8] in mimeographed form with appropriate and helpful illustrations. There is another, *The Mechanism of Instruction*,[9] by Colonel Dargue, also of the Army Air Forces. This tries to do a maximum job with minimum time. Finally, you should be familiar with one of Lt. Colonel Munson's books, *Leadership for American Army Leaders*.[10] You will find adequate assurance in this book as you will also find assurance in the others which I have enumerated that basically the job which you are doing is the kind of job which is needed in Army training.

II

Now for the second point. You can obtain no more serviceable an evaluation of the high points of speech difficulties than to hear a summary of criticisms that officers and noncommissioned officers make regarding the deficiencies in speech of the men they are training. *First, they say the voices are weak; the men can't make themselves heard on the drill field. Second, they are timid; they lack confidence; they won't speak up when given an opportunity to explain, to instruct, or to report. Third, they are nervous, they are fumbling and jittery. They are unable to stand erect and at ease or to face a group with confidence. Fourth, they are hard to understand; they do not enunciate well; they mumble or speak in incoherent phrases.* From my acquaintance with secondary school work, I suspect that these criticisms may be fundamentally no different than those you have to face in your classrooms.

III

From that itemization suppose we take up the last major point, a positive statement of Army needs. There are several: First: the ability to speak clearly, without embarrassment and to convey the

[7] War Department *Technical Manual 21-250*, April 19, 1943.

[8] *Public Speaking Guide for Instructors*. Army Air Forces. Mimeographed.

[9] Col. H. A. Dargue, *The Mechanism of Instruction*.

[10] Lt. Colonel F. M. Munson, Jr., *Leadership for American Army Leaders* (Infantry Journal Association, 1941), p. 96.

right idea the first time. The soldier is told how to perform most of his tasks by means of oral instructions. He also must be prepared to tell others by the same means.

Next, the ability to report with accuracy and clearness the results of reconnaissance. Any Army unit while on maneuvers or in a theater of operation must depend upon the keen observation, retentive memory and accurate reporting of soldiers assigned to all kinds of reconnaissance, scouting and patrolling.

Then: leadership in discussion. Army orientation courses wherein current issues, problems and ideas are handled must develop this manner of presentation as a calm, reasonable and intelligent procedure. The discussion or forum method in orientation is fully recognized in the new Morale Activities Division setup of the Army Service Forces.

Furthermore, the human voice needs training in giving orders and speaking to large groups out of doors. Commands must sound like commands. The listener must not strain to hear the speaker.

And finally, something new has been added. It is microphone technique. Most anyone can talk over a telephone and expect reasonable reception but with a microphone it is different. We are using the microphone in a rapidly increasing number of situations; in the small class address system, the walkie-talkie, the handy-talkie, Army ship public address, barge to shore, artillery observation, plane to ground, navigator to pilot, in tanks, in scout cars, in half tracks, tank busting destroyers, in our worldwide short wave net and even in the sound track of training films and recordings. This is a comparatively new technique but proper enunciation, voice modulation and voice level are of prime concern. This need ranks high in the enumeration just presented.

One final word on Army vocabulary. Many speech teachers inquire as to how they can help in this instance. Language is a living thing. It reflects both fact and circumstance. Colonel Colby in his new book, *Army Talk*,[11] suggests that "Soldier speech tends to abbreviation, sometimes being led in that direction by officialdom. Soldier slang leans toward the uncomplimentary and avoids the sentimental. Even in moments of relaxation, troops talk a jargon replete with technical phrases. Army language is highly specialized, the historic origin of very many of the words bearing no relation to their specialized modern meanings. In general, an Army resists change, and its familiar phrases continue conservatively, handed down to successive generations of soldiers. Few of them drop out."

By way of evaluation it may be stated that the Army vocabulary holds little promise for practical consideration in the pre-service speech curriculum. It is fitting in concluding this paper to acknowledge the substantial contribution of the speech profession in support of the war effort. Magnificent results have already been achieved. There is evidence to believe that our leaders will fashion an articulate statement that will pack all the implications of sound speech procedures into a timeless message of hope to peace loving people everywhere in the world.

[11] Col. Elbridge Colby, *Army Talk* (Princeton University Press, 1942), p. 232.

SPEECH AND THE SIGNAL CORPS

WILLIAM WEST
Captain, Signal Corps, Army Service Forces

Victor. This is Victor One.

To's East edge of trees on ridge 1300 yards ahead, our sector, 75 yards apart.

Destroy.

Double envelopment: First platoon on left; third platoon, support, base of fire.

Rally point: Dry stream 400 yards beyond objective. Alternate rally point, here.

I will be with support echelon.

Move out.

THAT was a tank commander's order given by radio to his tanks. Nerves are tense. Shells are bursting all around. The rat-tat-tat of machine guns are a staccato accompaniment to the artillery shells whistling overhead. Vision is poor. Action is swift.

The order is issued. Is there time to repeat that order? No! The unit must execute that order immediately; no member of the combat team can falter for a second or the result will be disaster.

The incident just cited is typical of what is happening every day on every fighting front throughout the world. The objective of our army is to destroy the enemy. Plans for accomplishing that mission are made by high command. Warning orders to prepare for the attack are transmitted to combat units by the written word. During the heat of battle, however, the progress of the attack is guided by the human voice, by radio, by telephone, or by direct contact. Microphone technique must be mastered. That voice must not fail.

As teachers of speech, you are interested in some of the problems we encounter in training.

Time is precious, either in combat or in training. The army must train soldiers to fit between four and five hundred different specialized jobs, many of which have no counterpart in civil life. If the army can use the civilian background and experience of Mr. Selectee, the task is simple, but there are thousands upon thousands whose talents must be remodeled to meet military requirements, and whether the soldier be a fighting, plodding doughboy, or a mine-lifting engineer who perforce has developed as delicate a touch as a surgeon, or a key-tapping radio operator who has the precise rhythm of a concert director, he will be an important cog in the military machine. Each cog must be carefully cut, but the primary consideration of all military training is not the individual, but rather the machine—the creation of a highly efficient fighting machine in which there can be no clashing of gears. Many hours are saved by use of intensive streamlined training programs which contain only the basic essentials necessary to achieve combat success.

II

Men in the army must be taught how to *do* things, and the problems encountered are similar to those found in the field of *vocational teaching*. General principles of educational psychology and pedagogy have been studied and applied in the development of a *general formula for instruction*. The formula is flexible; individual elements are not always present in the same quantity, and in some cases, certain components may be left out.

The formula is: PEDAED, a formula which uses the principal teaching devices; telling, asking, showing, and doing.

(1) PREPARATION
(2) EXPLANATION
(3) DEMONSTRATION

(4) APPLICATION
(5) EXAMINATION
(6) DISCUSSION

(1) *Preparation* by the instructor, including—
  (a) Preparation of the lesson material.
  (b) Preparation of the classroom (physical plant, including training aids). Classes rarely exceed 40 students; consequently, no speech amplifiers are required.
  (c) Preparation of the student.

(2) *Explanation* & (3) *Demonstration*

These steps may follow in sequence, or be interwoven. They constitute the presentation of the instructional unit to the class.

(4) *Application*

Following presentation of the instructional unit, the student is given an opportunity to perform the operation, thereby hastening the fixation process. This step is important, because men learn best by doing. The instructor watches carefully and corrects all mistakes.

(5) *Examination*

Here the instructor tests the knowledge of the student or his ability to perform the operation.

(6) *Discussion*

To clear up any doubtful points, and to emphasize the important points of the lesson, the instructor conducts a short discussion to further assist in the crystalization of the instruction unit in the student's mind.

III

How do speech and speech training enter this formula?

Since learning is the only true measure of effective instruction, the most important factor involved in the educational problem is the instructor himself. He must meet certain requirements—standards which are carefully catalogued by the student. The student reacts to whatever nudges (or activates) his senses—sight, hearing, touch, smell, and taste.

An instructor is first seen. His platform appearance is scored immediately on the student's tabulated estimate of the instructor. The score must be high for poise, neatness, and all the rest.

The instructor is next heard. It has often been said, "As soon as a speaker utters his first word, his personality steps forth from his throat." Whether that personality is clad in the worldly Chesterfield of clear, distinct, energetic delivery or garbed in an old bruised and battered cloak of careless, sloppy diction, will determine to a large extent the degree of success the instructor will attain.

When on the platform, the instructor must use everything in his bag of teaching tricks to accomplish his mission, which is to acquaint the student with new knowledge and to stimulate further thought on the subject by the student. The purpose of speech is to inform or explain.

The instructor's first problem is to arouse interest in the subject, a task which sometimes requires Herculean efforts. The American soldier is intelligent; he likes to know why he should learn to do or understand certain things. If, in the introduction of a lesson, the questions "What?" and "Why" are answered, initial interest can be readily developed. Once curiosity in the subject has been aroused, and the need for understanding the subject explained, initial motivation will have been accomplished and the instructional problem simplified. Too frequently the importance of preparing the student for reception of instruction is underestimated, but just like ladies' skirts, the introduction should be long enough to cover the subject, yet short enough to be attractive.

IV

After the student's attention has been focused on the subject, actual presentation follows. This is the instructor's proving ground. All his plans and prepara-

tions are now exposed and their worth determined.

In Signal Corps instruction, the subject is most frequently presented through the medium of simple exposition in any of its various forms, since our chief aim is understanding.

Where the lesson is on "How to Make a Field Wire Square Knot Tie," for example, the arrangement of material is purely mechanical, and an understanding of the process requires only a simple arrangement of the several steps by the student, but on the other hand, a lesson on "Theory of Frequency Modulation," requires much more careful consideration of the rules of exposition. How can he best help his students to understand frequency modulation—a subject which is new, complicated and different from other problems in the field of radio.

First, the simple laws of learning must be observed, and in the presentation of the new concept, new knowledge must be built up from the first foundation of what the student already knows.

In civilian educational systems, the problem is readily definable, for in the majority of instances, members of a given class have similar backgrounds, whereas in the army classroom, there is a wide disparity in background, and the springboard for new instruction is found at a different level today from what it was yesterday.

Anything new is always fascinating, exciting and entertaining, but unless it can be tied down by association with past experiences and past knowledge, no comprehension of the new will result. John Q. Soldier is especially sensitive to such conditions. He likes to know where he is in relation to where he was, and how he got there. Logical development and logical association of ideas are necessary to the development of interest and understanding in the subject.

In the lesson on frequency modulation, for example, general laws of electronic behavior, already known, are restated to form the basis for further instruction. Based upon these general principles, particular situations are evolved, and by deduction, certain conclusions are easily reached. Such a process is typical of theoretical instruction to the Signal Corps student. General laws, applied to particular cases, form the basis for certain conclusions. On other occasions, certain particular cases are studied, and from these individual cases, general laws may be inferred. These two types of exposition are common in military instruction.

In exposition of this type, the instructor is treading on dangerous ground. If he states laws and makes generalizations too freely, he will lose contact with his student. John Q. Soldier is real, and he believes in real things. The wise instructor, recognizing that fact, sprinkles his lessons with sufficient comparisons, analogies, and specific examples or illustrations to maintain the interest of the listener.

Through comparison and contrast, a bond is cemented between things known and unknown, and from a citation of specific examples, the student sees clearly the application of what he learns.

V

At all times the military instructor must impress the student with the battle importance of what he is studying. Reports from the many fighting fronts provide the instructor with tales of many incidents which can be used to great advantage in driving home his instruction. Those battle stories are sledge hammers and must be handled carefully. A sledge hammer is a mighty tool, but one does not require a sledge to drive home a tack. The point is: Stories and examples are vivid substantiation of facts or ideas, but they must be used only when and

where they are appropriate.

All interest factors must always be borne in mind. If instruction can be lively and entertaining, good results are assured. In addition to battle accounts, the instructor may use occasional humorous anecdotes, but they must be applicable, and above all they must crash the gate. A joke or funny story, if announced by the butler, usually falls flat on its face. Soldiers do not like to be told "I am going to make you laugh,"; instead, they prefer to be tickled in the ribs when they're not looking. Many an instructor overlooks that small detail.

Language and diction have an important bearing on student reception. Soldiers do not long listen to the erudite scholar who camouflages his intentions in complicated words, phrases, and structure. Although the novelty of it would initially captivate the student, interest will not be maintained, simply because he cannot understand the lecture. He likes good, clear, specific language. Clarity is essential to good exposition and to good military expression, for as the army puts it, "An order which can be misunderstood will be misunderstood." In addition, the instructor's vocal quality and force must be such as to invite attention. A vigorous presentation, reflecting the instructor's enthusiasm for his subject, will invariably induce favorable student reaction. By maintaining a lively communication contact with his class, by emphasizing important points by repetition or example, and by giving the student an opportunity to apply the principles taught, the instructor will be successful.

Learning is greatly enhanced when several of the senses are used simultaneously. Because visual impact is much more effective than aural impact in creating lasting impressions, the military instructor augments his exposition by full use of a wide variety of training aids made available to him: Simple charts and diagrams; models of all kinds, some mechanically operated, others electrically operated; photoramas; animated cartoons; demonstration troops, slides, film strips, and training films. The development of training aids is one of the finest examples of what the army can do to streamline its educational program and at the same time foster more effective instruction.

In the final analysis, it is the instructor himself who is the most important guide to learning. Through his voice and actions on the platform, new knowledge is imparted to the student, knowledge which will be used to one common end —destruction of the enemy.

VERBAL WARFARE

WALTER B. EMERY
Federal Communications Commission; on leave from Ohio State University

SHORTLY after the Moscow Conference, Dr. Goebbels, propaganda czar of Germany, wrote his version of that historic meeting. His article was broadcast by a Berlin short wave radio station and heard by monitors of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the Federal Communications Commission. Said Dr. Goebbels:

> . . . There can be no doubt that the Moscow Conference and its seeming results have not satisfied the nations, but have only increased their unrest. Nowhere is there any relaxation, everywhere there is only intensified fear and concern.

. . . Thus we were correct all along in our prognosis of the further development of Anglo-American-Soviet relations. The plutocracies not only find themselves taken in tow by Bolshevism, they are now altogether and completely delivered over to it, and they are its creatures. Out of blind hatred against the Reich and its just claims to life, they have taken on a partner whose goal is the Bolshevik world revolution.

Today more than ever before, the protection of Europe is entrusted to the German arms, alone. If they failed, it would mean that our Continent would face its imminent end.

The two-fold purpose of this sinister verbal outburst is obvious. By suggesting that the Russians threaten to engulf Europe, Dr. Goebbels hoped to attract the favor of neutral countries for the German cause, and to promote distrust and disunity among the Allied nations.

This is an example of enemy propaganda which floods the airways night and day. More than three hundred sixty powerful transmitters located in fifty-eight different political units, including Allied, Axis and neutral nations, are carrying on psychological warfare. Approximately 6,000 programs are broadcast each day.

It is the function of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Division of the Federal Communications Commission to keep departments of the Federal Government informed concerning the content of such broadcasts. The volume of available material is well over two and a half million words every twenty-four hours, and it has been estimated that the monitors of the FBIS hear, record and distribute more than 150,000 words a day.

II

Started nine months before Pearl Harbor, the FBIS had by July, 1942 developed its basic structure and organization. This consists of an editorial and distribution center in Washington, which also serves as a major listening post for European broadcasts; includes two listening posts on the western coast for broadcasts across the Pacific; one at Kingsville, Texas, to cover Latin-American programs, and another in Puerto Rico to monitor South European transmissions. Also, it maintains a London editorial outpost, attached to the main BBC monitoring unit, serving as a selection agency for broadcast material cabled to the United States, and a distribution center for American war agencies in London. All these listening posts are connected by two-way telecommunication with the Washington headquarters.

Visualize, if you will, a linguist listening to a program as it is broadcast and automatically recorded. The program may come in any one of thirty-three languages and dialects. He listens carefully and types a summary of the main points covered. These summaries prepared at the different listening posts are then given to editors who identify significant materials, order the full texts translated from recordings, and transmit the most valuable parts by wire to Washington. Experts at the Capital make a final check, eliminate duplication, and prepare the materials for distribution. Governmental agencies such as the Office of War Information and the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs receive minute-by-minute service by means of an omnibus teletype wire. General mimeographed reports are sent by messenger to more than three hundred desks where they are used, for the most part, by regional intelligence specialists.

III

Studies of broadcasts over a two-year period reveal that there are four general lines of strategy used by the Axis in this war of words. Robert D. Leigh, Director of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, lists the following:

1. The enemy is weak, disunited and torn by faction.
2. We are strong and united, possess superior men and materials, and have a determined and unshakable spirit.
3. The enemy is degenerate and immoral.
4. We are noble and virtuous.

Dr. Leigh has pointed out that in the early days of the war, the Nazis played upon the first of these propaganda themes in many broadcasts. The Americans were characterized as a soft people, not possessing adequate stamina or discipline to wage effective war. Berlin declared that our industrial potential was low, and Goering was stupid enough to proclaim that we could make razor blades and chewing gum but not tanks and airplanes.

At the same time Berlin propagandists were flooding the ether with the argument that the Germans were a strong and unconquerable people. The invincibility of the Axis powers was consistently and emphatically alleged. It was supermen against weaklings in this world struggle, and the ultimate triumph of the Germans was asserted to be "historic inevitability."

With continued military successes, this line of talk could be used to some advantage, but Hitler's defeat at Stalingrad and his later reverses called for a change in strategy. Russian resistance, Rommel's retreat, American production, destructive allied air raids—these were facts which did not square with the argument, "We are strong, and you are weak." English and American airplanes were exacting a terrific toll, and giant bombers became symbols of our increasing military power. No longer able to deceive the German people as to our real strength, the Berlin broadcasters changed the subject and charged that we were cruel and immoral. We dropped bombs on hospitals and schools, killing helpless men, women and children, so they said. It was declared we took a sadistic delight in dropping explosives on innocent civilians. Some of the words used to describe the Americans were: plutocratic, imperialistic, predatory and bullying. Our young men, who earlier had been characterized as jazz-crazed softies were now called ruthless, destructive, uncultured barbarians.

The same technique was used against the Russians. It had to be admitted that the Russians were showing powerful resistance, so Dr. Goebbels and his commentators described them as animalistic and brutal. Shortly after the Battle of Stalingrad, a Berlin radio station broadcast the following description of the Russian soldiers who took part in the fight:

> I have had the sensation of being face to face with wild animals. . . . Like a pack of wolves, Bolshevist soldiers rush forward to kill because that is all they have been taught. . . . They massacre all they find, men, women and children. These have created no monuments, no art, nothing except machines to destroy. . . . This horde, if victorious, would march to Calais and Gibraltar, massacring and burning cities. . . . The Jewish riff-raff of White-Chapel will stab you in the back. Think how amusing it would be to have your wife raped by a drunken Communist or by a Jewish Commissar! Think of the children whose eyes were gouged out! All this might happen if it were not for the German Army. . . . Do you wonder that the Jews never look you straight in the face?

In other broadcasts the Russians were spoken of as "gruesome Bolsheviks." The Cossack was described as a brutal beast, devoid of reason, who could "explode his pistol in the face of a person with the same ease we eat a caramel and smoke a cigaret." The linguistic line which was beamed from Berlin transmitters was in substance: "Support the German Army which is your only protection against Communistic cruelty."

From the very beginning of the war, the Nazis have prated about their nobility and virtue. They have claimed that they have no desire to exploit other

peoples, but benevolently intend to establish the New Order that will bring peace and happiness to all Europe. With millions of people under the Nazi yoke, this line does not square with the well known facts and has lost much of its effectiveness.

IV

Almost every conceivable strategy and trick have been used by Dr. Goebbels in this verbal war. German transmitters this very minute are sending forth a stream of words intended to bring about disunity among the Allied nations. Enemy propagandists who understand the principles of persuasion are striking repeatedly at the psychological ties which bind these countries into a fighting unit. They are saying to the British that the "ruthless Russians" and the "American plutocrats" are out to destroy the British Empire. Only last week, Goebbels stated: "In this war we are witnessing one of the most tremendous events in modern history: The slow disintegration of the British Empire and the acquisition of its heritage by alien powers, who at best regard our Continent as the object of their plutocratic and Bolshevik exploitation." They are saying to the Americans that the British are simply using us as tools to help them save their empire; they are saying to both British and Americans that Russian Bolshevism threatens to envelop the world, and they broadcast to the Russians that we have been slow to open up a second front.

V

I have had time to discuss only briefly the major lines of strategy which have been followed by the Nazi propagandists. The Japanese and other enemy powers are active on the propaganda front, though they have lacked the skill which at times has been exhibited by the Germans.

Through the good work of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, it has been possible to hear the enemy talk and to record his speech. Expert analysts who know Axis countries, psychologically, politically, geographically, and historically, are busy at work evaluating foreign broadcasts. When the enemy lies, as he often does, or when he shifts his strategic line and emphasis, or when he reports one story to this country and the exact opposite to another, there is a basis for deductions which have military value. About 50,000 words a day selected by these experts are reported to the President, to the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, to all the high commanding officers, to the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and to the Office of War Information. While all the techniques and procedures of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service cannot now be revealed, I hope I have given you a general idea of the valuable part it is playing in the war.

In conclusion, I should like to state that the Library of Congress, Princeton University, and Stanford University have been officially designated as depositories for the printed broadcasts of all belligerents in this war. When peace comes, these verbatim reports will constitute excellent source material for research studies in various phases of speech. Also recordings of significant broadcasts are being preserved, and will be useful to scholars who will wish to make studies of the vocal aspects of propaganda and persuasion.

PUBLIC ADDRESS IN A DEMOCRACY AT WAR

KENNETH G. HANCE
University of Michigan

IN 1912, Samuel Eliot Morison, biographer of Harrison Gray Otis, remarked: "Down to the last half-century, oratory was one of the most potent forces in moulding public opinion and in arousing popular enthusiasm in America. Since then our susceptibility to the power of human speech has gradually declined. . . ." This statement amazes me. I am sure that it amazes you. Your experiences and mine do not, I am sure, lead us to make a similar statement, even in 1944 when our nation is at war. Speechmaking appears to be very much with us. It is practiced by us; its use is advocated by governmental agencies and public officials; we are being exhorted to "talk about" this war and the peace that is to come.

Now I realize that this is not news. You know of these activities—the majority of you are in the midst of them—and you know that in World War I similar conditions prevailed. For instance, that the Committee on Public Information conducted extensive speaking activities, arranged mass meetings, and promoted the Four Minute Men organization with its 75,000 speakers making 755,190 speeches in 5,200 communities. It is not my purpose to develop this theme or to suggest the novelty of this circumstance. Nor is it my purpose to give you an account of the speaking of the President and his associates or of the Congress. You know of it, and furthermore a study of it would require more than the available time. Nor shall I consider such public address as that in the pulpit, in the courts, in the "entertainment" phase of the lecture platform, or in the customary lecture system in schools and colleges. Neither shall I treat of the radio as a specific medium. What I am interested in is the kind of speechmaking that is distinctive in this nation at war. In other words: (1) What are the occasions and the circumstances? (2) Who is doing the speaking? (3) What is being talked about? (4) What is the significance of this in a democracy at war? Of necessity there will be more generalizations than specific cases, and no doubt there will be omissions; but the coverage will be as complete as possible. The first two questions will be considered very briefly, with more attention given to the third.

I

The occasions and the circumstances. As will be observed more fully in Section III, the occasions and circumstances are as varied as the institutions "Town Hall in New York," "A women's club in Utah," and "A grange in Michigan" connote. It is literally true that everywhere America is talking. It may be an address on October 12 by Will Rogers, Jr., in San Francisco's Town Hall Forum of the West; a Sinclair Lewis-Lewis Browne debate in Kansas City's Town Hall on October 25; a lecture by Colonel Carlos P. Romulo at the Sinai Temple Forum in Chicago; a symposium by high-school students at a PTA meeting in Terre Haute, Indiana; a series of speeches in Birmingham, Alabama, by a six-man team of the Christian Mission on World Order; an address by Sumner Welles at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York on October 28; a discussion by steel mill workers in their Gary Neighborhood Forums; or a forum at the Fenton, Michigan, Community House.

Or the occasion may be the Citizens' Emergency Conference for Interracial Unity at the Hunter College Assembly Hall or the Annual Conference of the National Urban League in Chicago. It may be a War Loan or a USO-Community War Chest rally. It may be an old and established meeting night of a fifty-year old forum or an evening's discussion in the living room of a Chicago "block leader." It may be a vitriolic harangue against the government, a dispassionate lecture, a forum period, or a discussion in a small group.

America is talking—perhaps in greater numbers and with more purpose than ever before. Opportunities for participation by the average man are probably more numerous than before. The concern of leaders in all fields that America talk about its problems is perhaps at a new peak.

II

Who is talking? As previously intimated, and as will be illustrated later, all America is talking. It may be Wendell Willkie or Secretary Morgenthau at a War Bond Rally; it may be one of that great body of professional platform lecturers; it may be a business leader at a conference; it may be a member of a speaking mission; it may be a member of a Speakers' Bureau of the Red Cross, the OCD, or the Community War Chest; it may be a high-school or a college Victory Speaker; it may be any one of the rest of us on the platform, as a questioner of a speaker, or as a member of a discussion group. Significant it is that in terms of both volume of speaking and effect upon a democracy at war, the speaking of "the rest of us" may be the most important.

III

What is being talked about? The topics of the public address that we are studying can be most conveniently grouped as follows: war drives and war organizations, home front problems, criticism of the war effort, background of war events, peoples and nations in the war, and post-war problems.

It is hardly necessary here to recount the speaking being done *on behalf of war drives and organizations.* You are familiar with the War Loan drives and the steps being taken by the Red Cross, the USO-Community War Chest organizations, and others to set up speakers' bureaus and to train speakers. Merely typical was the rally held here in New York on September 16 at which Carl Van Doren addressed an audience of over 2,500 persons gathered under the auspices of five patriotic societies to promote the War Loan drive. Or a series of War Bond rallies held in New York on September 23 at which Secretary Morgenthau delivered nine speeches in one day to a total of several thousand persons. Or the rally at Raritan, New Jersey, on September 19, when five speakers addressed a huge gathering, which subscribed to more than $1,300,000 worth of bonds.

As for speaking on behalf of organizations, one instance is all that time permits. The Ann Arbor, Michigan, Community War Chest organization set up a bureau with a score of speakers, scheduled speeches over a period of a month, and climaxed the drive by a rally attended by nearly 5,000 persons and addressed by a distinguished foreign correspondent, DeWitt MacKenzie. The Red Cross is in the process of organizing a speakers' bureau, has a roster of forty volunteers, has set up a four-weeks' training program, and plans to schedule approximately a hundred speeches during February.

Public address is also being widely used as the medium in disseminating *information about many home front*

problems and in crystallizing sentiment concerning such issues. Victory Speakers and others are explaining Rationing, Conservation, Housing, Race Relationships, etc. For example, on February 26 lectures on OPA point-rationing were given to fifty church congregations in Harlem alone. Another case is that of a series of lectures beginning on September 20 and continuing for fifteen weeks for teachers in the New York City school system. Sponsored by the City-Wide Citizens Committee on Harlem, this series will develop the theme "The Negro in the American Scene." "Religious Good Will in a Democracy" has been the theme of several speaking missions and discussions in army camps. On November 8-13 a team composed of Protestants, Jews, and Catholics visited Fort Knox and addressed approximately 50,000 men; and another addressed the men at Camp Crowder. These and other groups have within recent months reached an estimated two million men at camps and forts.

Such problems as Taxation and Food have been the basis of conferences throughout the country. For instance, on September 17 there was held in Chicago the National Food Conference on Food and War, with representatives from twenty-six states and such speakers as the Georgia Commissioner of Agriculture, the Dean of the Cornell University College of Agriculture, and others. On the 18th, the National Taxation Conference of the Associated State Chambers of Commerce also met in Chicago for consideration of "The Federal Tax Plan"; and on the same day the National Association of Food Chains held a conference in Chicago, while the New York Metropolitan Milk Marketing Area held a conference in New York, addressed by several speakers.

In a recent issue of *Program*, twenty-two lectures were billed as filling dates upon subjects pertaining to current economic and social problems. One instance is Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, who started in October on a coast-to-coast lecture tour on "problems of waging the war on the home front" and similar subjects.

But speakers are not confining themselves to disseminating information about home front problems. They are *criticizing many of the agencies dealing with these problems and are denouncing phases of the war effort.* For instance, Fulton Lewis, Jr., Mutual's ace commentator, is on a lecture tour this winter. In one speech, "What's Happening in Washington," he devotes the principal portion of his time to an indictment of certain OPA officials and practices, of aspects of Lend-Lease, of certain practices of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, and of views of certain officials in the Treasury Department. Other speakers are decrying what they describe as the trend toward dictatorship, are objecting to "Boondoggling on a Global Basis," are criticizing the strategy which they say is neglecting General MacArthur, and are even objecting to certain of our war-time alliances. For instance, Colonel Robert McCormick, of *Chicago Tribune* fame, spoke in Detroit on December 15, criticizing Great Britain's policies, indicting our policies with respect to Japan, and objecting to any foreign policy that is not "patterned upon the Monroe Doctrine."

The background of war events is also being widely discussed by speakers today. Foreign correspondents who have just returned from the front are booked through the winter. For example, Captain André Maurois, recently in North Africa as liaison officer between General Giraud and the American forces, returned on January 1 and will remain for a ten-week lecture tour, the limit that will be permitted. Henry C. Wolfe returned in October from the "European

Theatre of Operation" to speak on "What Next in Europe." It is said that "lectures by him have become a sort of serial story and audiences every season have him back for the latest installment." His specialty this year is to be the Balkans, Italy, and Greece. One of the most popular speakers is Thomas A. B. Ditton, who is billed as "bringing with him a stirring story of Anglo-American naval co-operation which has cleared the Nazi submarine from the Atlantic, preparations for the invasion of Western Europe, and . . . postwar planning in the British Isles." Major Ditton has been an officer in a new LC type invasion barge and accompanied Churchill on the trip to the Quebec conferences. Also fully booked for transcontinental tours are two Associated Press correspondents, Max Hill and John A. Moroso, Jr., the former recently in Japan and the latter with the Navy at Casablanca and Sicily.

Another is Ivan Dmitri, who returned in September after a world tour by air of battlefronts and outposts of American forces. In a recent issue of *Program*, approximately thirty lecturers were billed as speaking upon this topic: the background or explanation of war events.

Perhaps even more popular as a subject for speaking is *the peoples and nations in the war*. In the same issue of *Program*, more than one hundred billings of this type are noted—ranging from an illustrated lecture on "The Russia We Knew" to first-hand accounts of the Japanese by persons who only recently were repatriated. One of the most popular speakers in this field is Colonel Carlos P. Romulo, a member of MacArthur's staff and often referred to as "the last man off Bataan," who during the year has delivered 277 lectures in 269 days, speaking upon the Filipinos and their faith in the United States. Also there is Robert Bellaire, head of the United Press Bureau in Tokio at the time of Pearl Harbor, who was thrown into a prison camp. "He is telling American audiences what kind of people the Japanese really are, showing us they do not think as we do, do not have the same emotions, the same codes." Likewise, there is Edward Tomlinson, on a coast-to-coast tour that is booked to the limit, his principal theme being "The Other Americas," a discussion of the foreign policies of the other American republics and of their participation in the war. A sold-out tour greeted Edmund Stevens in late December when he returned from Russia with "a first-hand look at what Russia is doing." More than one hundred lectures are being given this season by Dr. C. J. Hambro, Norwegian statesman who recently returned from England and a visit with his King; he will speak upon "Norway" as well as upon the "League of Nations," of which he is the head. From the reception tendered these returning observers it is evident that America wants "the news behind the news" concerning her allies and others in the war; and through the medium of speechmaking America is being informed on this subject, this year.

The five subjects just reviewed are indeed important—and the amount of speechmaking devoted to them is significant—but probably the outstanding circumstance is the attention directed to *postwar problems*. From East to West and North to South, under almost all circumstances and under a multitude of auspices, America is talking about the shape of things to come. Professional lecturers on the platform; speakers at Town Hall; high-school students in Terre Haute; farmers in Michigan; soldiers in USO centers; Rotary Clubs in every state; steel mill workers in Gary; forums in San Jose, Hartford, and Springfield; Block Discussion groups in Chicago—these are but a few instances.

If a citizenry can talk itself into a sensible peace, the United States assuredly should be able to do so. This movement is so significant that it will be described here in some detail—with a plan that proceeds from the top to the bottom, from the "name" speaker in the city to the discussion group in the rural area—but of necessity touching upon only representative situations.

Perhaps one of the most notable events of the year occurred on September 25 at the *New York Times* Hall, when a capacity crowd of civic leaders and representatives of colleges, churches, and other groups gathered to hear a symposium and panel discussion on postwar problems. Participants were Ely Culbertson, Republican J. W. Fullbright, Senator Joseph Ball, John Foster Dulles, Hugh Gibson, James T. Shotwell, Clarence Streit, and Ruth Bryan Owen, with Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick as the chairman. The American Legion Convention in Omaha in September was devoted more largely to postwar matters than to other problems. And *Program* lists sixty speakers of the lecture platform who are featuring this subject in its many ramifications.

Ely Culbertson, with his "Plan for World Settlement," is a virtual one-man speaking mission. In October he filled twenty engagements; and in November, nearly thirty. From January through April he is on a coast-to-coast tour with an average of five engagements per week—and he has refused as many dates as he has been able to accept.

Forums throughout the nation are concentrating upon postwar themes. For example, the San Jose, California, Adult Center is considering the problem "Can America Take Cradle-to-Grave Security Plans?" A public conference in Skaneateles, New York, sponsored by the Division of Adult Education and Library Extension of the State Department of Education and planned for "ordinary citizens, or civic and community leaders, rather than for college students and teachers" was held from July 29 to August 2 on the subject "Building the Peace." The Hartford Council for Adult Education initiated in January, 1943, a series of talks to labor union groups on "The Shape of the War" which resulted in the organization, at the request of the unions, of several discussion groups continuing the topics of the addresses. Cooper Union in New York, which has recently increased the number of its meetings by nearly 20 per cent, now has three groups of forum courses: The Home Front, American Roots, and Global Themes. And the Peoples' University in Lansing, Michigan, is conducting a Citizens' Forum on postwar problems.

Many schools are pioneering in an attempt to serve their communities by offering civic education on postwar problems through the medium of public address. In Terre Haute, for instance, twenty high-school students, speaking on "Winning the Peace as Well as the War," have addressed classes and assemblies in their schools, have addressed the PTA Council and each PTA group, the American Association of University Women, the American Legion, and luncheon clubs. This is being duplicated in the states of Oklahoma, Utah, and Michigan, in Glens Falls, New York; New Ulm, Minnesota; and Detroit, Michigan, to mention a few instances. In Detroit, for example, 225 high-school students are speaking and leading discussions on three phases of the postwar theme: The Local Level, The National Level, and The International Level.

The Peoples' Lobby promoted during September and October a six-weeks' speaking trip by its executive secretary, Benjamin C. Marsh, consisting of 57 meetings in 22 states. Speaking on "Peace

and the Profit System" and "Winning the Peace," he addressed such groups as the Rotary Club in Topeka and church forums in Pittsburgh, Detroit, Seattle, Los Angeles, and Salt Lake City. The New York school system began on October 12 a series of lectures on post-war problems. Designed especially for the 3,000 administrators in the system, this series is being addressed by representatives of several fields, the first being Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the *New York Times*. At Harper's Ferry, Virginia, in September was held the International Educational Assembly, with persons in attendance from the United States and thirty foreign countries. Speakers from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Norway, and China developed phases of the theme "Re-education of the Axis."

Perhaps one of the most significant speaking movements of the year is the Christian Mission on World Order, sponsored by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. This Mission, consisting of more than fifty prominent clergymen and an equal number of laymen, reached 102 cities during November with an average of five addresses in each city. The opening session was held on October 28 at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York City with a capacity audience of 5,000 present to hear a group of speakers including Sumner Welles. A similar mission was undertaken by the Methodist Church in January, when the Crusade for a Christian World Order got underway. With an expressed purpose of influencing at least one million Methodists to write directly to their senators and representatives on the necessity for a "Christian World Order," this crusade enlisted several hundred ministers and laymen in a nation-wide speaking campaign. These speakers visited seventy-six principal cities in every part of the United States. Twenty-three teams of speakers held city-wide and conference-wide mass meetings during January. These meetings provided the setting for a follow-up movement, which will include the study of the subject in church schools and discussion groups, as well as for a home visitation campaign.

The public platform, however, is not the only place where ideas are being disseminated and points of view probably crystallized. Countless discussion groups are serving to create "an informed and understanding America" with respect to the war and the peace. From Town Hall's small discussion groups to the homes of mill workers in Gary to groups in Abilene, Texas, America is discussing what is perhaps the most vital issue of the century. The rank-and-file of America are talking about the business of this democracy.

We are familiar with New York's Town Hall and its combined forum-discussion groups program. But we may be less aware of the successful Gary Fireside Forum, organized in 1940 in the home of Reuben E. Olson, retired president of the Gary Council of Churches. Administered by an all-city commission of 33 members and composed of persons of all races and creeds, this enterprise has included as many as fifty discussion groups. They have been characterized as "a grand illustration of a democracy in action. The spirit they generate would go far to make our economic, political, and racial problems easier to solve."

And just a few miles from Gary is perhaps the most ambitious program of its kind yet devised by one organization. Called the Chicago Block Discussion Program and administered by the Morale Department of the Metropolitan Chicago OCD, it is in the process of reaching two million or more adults through 15,000 discussion groups. By late October it had developed to the

point where 550 discussion leaders had received training in two courses and where these leaders were prepared to train 15,000 block captains to become competent leaders of discussion groups. Thus far the program has included discussions of such topics as Recreation, Waste, the Anti-Strike Bill, and the Prevention of Future Wars.

On a state-wide scale, the Michigan program illustrates an attempt to use public address in "making democracy work." Sponsored by the Extension Services of the tax-supported colleges and universities in the state, this program is epitomized by such phrases as "While we defeat fascism, let's strengthen democracy" and "Plan now to win the peace." It is utilizing existing clubs and other groups, is cooperating with community centers and adult education agencies, and also is creating new opportunities for discussion. Today it is in operation in nearly one hundred communities after highly successful organizational meetings in Belding, Dowagiac, Fenton, and Traverse City.

America is discussing postwar problems in USO centers, where forums and question-and-answer periods, as well as small groups, have been organized. For instance, the USO in Columbus, Georgia, has organized a Town Hall; the USO at Spartanburg, North Carolina, is using a combination of motion pictures and discussion groups to develop such topics as "What Are We Fighting For?"; and similar movements are observed in as widely separated USO centers as Alexandria, Louisiana; Biloxi, Mississippi; Rockford, Illinois; and Abilene, Texas.

IV

What is the significance of this? The implications and the conclusions are apparent. First, it is significant that such speechmaking is permitted in a nation at war (here is "democracy at work"). Second, it is significant that "all of us" are talking—not a few actual or self-styled leaders or a body of propagandists. Third, it is significant that much of the speaking is concerned with the why and wherefore of contemporary affairs—that analysis, reflection, criticism are much in evidence. Fourth, if it be true that " 'Divide and Conquer' can best be met by an application of freedom of speech to the forum or town meeting," it is apparent that in its speechmaking America has a strong bulwark of defense. Fifth, is its distinct challenge to teachers of speech. All America *is* talking. What can we do to make it well-composed and well-presented talk? What can we do to make better speakers and better participants in discussion?

In closing, I shall recall Morison's statement made in 1912. What would he say concerning the use and the power of human speech were he to observe speechmaking in the United States in 1944, especially in view of the fact that it is engaged in the greatest war of all time?

SAMUEL JOHNSON ON RHETORIC

WILBUR E. MOORE
Central Michigan College of Education

SAMUEL JOHNSON, who probably is best known for his conversational powers and his critical writings, revealed throughout his life a scholarly interest in rhetoric and oratory, although he wrote no treatise on either. Living during the Augustan age of British oratory, and being intimately associated with Fox, Burke, Sheridan, and Erskine through his membership in the Literary Club, he discussed frequently with them the principles of persuasive speaking. Furthermore, he had a deep affection for the art that gave him his start as the man of letters. For it was his "Debates in the Senate of Magna Lilliputia," which were published in *The Gentleman's Magazine,* and which purported to be reports of the debates in Parliament, that established him as a rising, if still unimportant, figure in the literary world. The "Debates" were in no sense of the word reports, for frequently Johnson wrote them with hardly more information than the names of the members who spoke.[1]

Arthur Murphy, an occasional associate of Johnson, relates in the preface of his edition of *The Works of Samuel Johnson* (1795) how the secret of Johnson's authorship of the debates became known. On an occasion when Alexander Wedderburne (Lord Loughborough), a Scotch ruling elder of Kirk and an orator of some renown who had been taught by Thomas Sheridan, Dr. Philip Francis, translator of Horace and Demosthenes, and Murphy and Johnson were dining with Samuel Foote, the actor, Dr. Francis observed that the speech delivered by Mr. Pitt (the Elder) on a particular occasion was the best he had ever heard. He added that he had employed eight years of his life in the study of Demosthenes and had finished a translation[2] of that celebrated orator with all the decorations of style and language within reach of his capacity, but he had met nothing equal to the speech of Pitt's.[3] Most of the company remembered the debate and some passages were cited that received the approbation and applause of all present. During the conversation, Johnson was silent. As soon as the praise subsided, he remarked casually, "That speech I wrote in a garret in Exeter Street." The company was amazed and stared silently at Johnson. Then Dr. Francis asked how the speech of Pitt's could have been written by him. Said Johnson:

> Sir, I wrote it in Exeter Street. I never have been in the gallery of the House of Commons but once. Cave (the publisher of *The Gentleman's Magazine*) had interest with the doorkeepers. He and the persons employed under him gained admittance and brought away the subject of discussion, the names of the speakers, the sides they took, the order in which they arose, together with the arguments advanced in the course of the debate. The whole was afterward communicated to me, and I composed the speeches in the form which they now have in the Parliamentary debates.[4]

To this discovery, Dr. Francis made the reply, "Then, Sir, you have exceeded Demosthenes himself."

The excellence of Johnson's rhetorical practice is likewise attested to by a modern critic. David Nichol Smith writes in Volume X of the *Cambridge History of English Literature:*

[1] Samuel Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson* (London, 1924), I, 80.

[2] *The Orations of Demosthenes* (London, 1753-55).
[3] *The Works of Samuel Johnson*, ed. Arthur Murphy (London, 1795), I, 43ff.
[4] *Ibid.*

His reports are, in fact, original work, and a very great work. To us who know the secret of their authorship, it is surprising that they should not have been recognized as the work of a man of letters. There is more of Johnson than of Pitt in the famous speech about the atrocious crime of being a young man.[5]

II

Johnson, early in his career, wrote that, "Rhetoric and Poetry supply life with the highest intellectual pleasures; and in the hands of virtue are of great use for the recommendation of just sentiments and illustrous examples."[6] In his preface to *The Preceptor,* a book written by James Dodsley and designed to supply the young mind with the necessities of knowledge for most stations in life, he writes of rhetorical precepts:

> . . . however neglected, they extend their importance as far as men are found who communicate their thoughts to one another; they are equally useful to the highest and the lowest; they may often contribute to make ignorance less elegant; and may it not be observed that they are wanted even for the embellishment of learning.

Johnson's philosophy of prose composition was always that of the rhetorician. Although he won his reputation as a man of letters, he was one of those authors who early discovered that the impulse not only to communicate but also to attract and influence a more or less clearly defined audience underlies stylistic methods as well as modes of invention. The author as well as the speaker must study his audience, learn their ways of reasoning, and understand their feelings and emotions, their aspirations and longings. In *The Rambler* he wrote:

> Among the numerous requisites that must concur to complete an author, few are of more importance than an early entrance into the living world. The seeds of knowledge may be planted in solitude but must be cultivated in public. Argumentation may be taught in colleges and theories formed in retirement; but the artifices of embellishment, and the powers of attraction, can be gained only by general converse. The orator who wears out his days and nights in perpetual research is too apt to lose in his elocution what he adds to his wisdom.[7]

The writer or the speaker who did not invent his topics to suit the beliefs and experience of his audience would have no "facility of inculcating his speculations, of adapting himself to the various degrees of intellect." He would talk "to most unintelligibly and to all unpleasantly."[8]

Johnson was a follower of Aristotle, not Plato. He thought that wisdom and philosophy alone, no matter how profound, were unable to win converts. Truth had to be treated rhetorically if it was to win general acceptance. Rhetorical training would help develop persuasiveness[9] but long experience with all types of listeners was necessary for the acquirement of skill in amplification and adaptation. In *The Adventurer* Johnson wrote:

> Nothing but long habits and frequent experiments can confer the power of changing a position into various forms, presenting it in different views, connecting it with known and granted truths, fortifying it with intelligible argument and illustrating it with apt similitude.

Again in *The Adventurer* he wrote:

> But though learning may be conferred by solitude, its application must be attained by general converse. He has learned to no pur-

[5] "The atrocious crime of being a young man, which the honourable gentleman has, with such spirit and decency, charged upon me, I shall neither attempt to palliate or deny, but content myself with wishing that I may be one of those whose follies may cease with their youth, and not of that number who are ignorant in spite of experience." From the "Reply of Lord Chatham when attacked by Horatio Walpole," delivered March 6, 1741. *Select British Eloquence,* ed. Chauncey Goodrich (1870), p. 81.

[6] *Works,* II, 247.

[7] *Works,* VI, 167.

[8] *Works,* III, 200.

[9] For greatest progress, pupils should consult Quintilian and Vossius's *Rhetorick.* See *Works,* II, 247.

pose that is not able to teach; and he will always teach unsuccessfully who cannot recommend his sentiments by his diction or address.[10]

Furthermore, the orator must learn to meet indifference and opposition from audiences. Only in the arena of public discussion can he learn to wield his weapons of demonstration in the face of hostile critics. In *The Rambler* Johnson warns:

> He who brings with him into a clamorous multitude the timidity of recluse speculation and has never hardened his front in public life or accustomed his passions to the vicissitudes and accidents, the triumphs and defeats of mixed conversation, will blush at the stare of petulant incredulity and suffer himself to be driven by a burst of laughter from the fortress of demonstration.

Likewise, he warns against a very common practice of attempting to appeal for popular approval by cheapening both the content and the manner of discourse. Again in *The Rambler* he states:

> To avoid the dangerous imputations of pedantry, scholars sometimes divest themselves with too much haste of their academic formality and in their endeavors to accommodate their notions with their style to common conceptions, talk rather of anything than of that which they understand, and sink to insipidity of sentiment and meanness of expression. To use learning and rhetoric judiciously requires long association with and close study of mankind.

Ethos, too, as well as the adaptation of topics to the opinions of the audience, held an important place in Johnson's conception of persuasive discourse. Like Quintilian, Johnson believed that good moral character was essential to oratory. Such quotations as the following from the *Phaedo* are frequent in his writings:

> The wretch that often has deceived
> Though truth he speaks is ne'er believed.

Likewise, from Aristotle, Johnson frequently quotes the phrase, "The gain of uttering falsehoods is not to be believed when speaking the truth." An orator must look to his character if he is to win acceptance. The fruits of persuasive speech and virtue are suggested by Johnson in the following paraphrase of the epitaph on the tomb of Thomas Hanmer:

> In life's first bloom his public toils began,
> At once commenced the senator and man.
> In business dextrous, weighty in debate,
> Thrice ten long years he labour'd for the State;
> In ev'ry speech persuasive wisdom flow'd
> In ev'ry act refulgent virtue glow'd:
> Suspended faction ceas'd from rage and strife,
> To hear his eloquence, and praise his life.
> Resistless merit fix'd the Senate's choice,
> Who hailed him Speaker with united voice.
> Illustrous age! How bright thy glories shone,
> When Hanmer fill'd the chair—and Anne the throne!
> Then when dark arts obscur'd each fierce debate,
> When mutual frauds perplex'd the maze of state,
> The moderator firmly mild appeared—
> Beheld with love—with veneration heard.[11]

III

Johnson was contemptuous of bodily action and facial expression in a speaker. Only before the most unintelligent audiences could gestures and movement be justified. In *The Idler* he alludes to the frequent complaint that English oratory, however forcible in argument or elegant in expression, was deficient because English speakers wanted energy of action. To this complaint he replies:

> The use of English oratory is only at the bar, in the Parliament, and in the church. Neither the judges of our laws nor the representatives of our people would be much affected by laboured gesticulation, or believe any man the more because he rolled his eyes or puffed his cheeks, or spread abroad his arms, or stamped the ground, or thumped his breast, or turned his eyes sometimes to

[10] *Works*, III, 275.

[11] *Works*, I, 155.

the ceiling and sometimes to the floor. Upon men intent only upon the truth, the arm of the orator has little power; a credible testimony, or a cogent argument will overcome all the art of modulation and all the violence of contortion.

Again and again, in his conversations with Boswell, Reynolds, and Burke he would give similar declamations against action in public speaking.[12] He proved, to his own satisfaction, that the Athenians were brutish because Demosthenes had used gestures[13] and that Whitefield was no orator because he was too active with his body.[14]

However amusing his ideas of delivery may be to us, we still must recognize that Johnson's theory of rhetoric is essentially sound. Unlike De Quincey, Johnson did not view rhetoric as mere playfulness of the intellect whose chief function was to provide an elaborate "form of beauty which shrinks from the strife of business and could neither arise nor make itself felt in a tumultuous assembly." On the contrary, with him it was what Aristotle held it to be, the art of discovering all the available means of persuasion. Surely we may regret, as he did himself, that he never had an opportunity to speak in Parliament, even if we cannot readily believe with Burke that if he "had come early into Parliament, he certainly would have been the greatest speaker that ever was there."

[12] Boswell, *op. cit.*, I, 221.
[13] *Ibid.*, I, 483.
[14] *Ibid.*, I, 386.

THE EARLY PAMPHLETS OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON

ORA B. DE VILBISS DAVISSON

ALEXANDER HAMILTON, well-known as a lawyer and a statesman, was also an orator and a writer of persuasive discourse. Of his persuasive writings, the *Federalist* papers are by far the best known; but two pamphlets, written at the age of seventeen,[1] indicate the same specific qualities of deep analysis and logical coherence which appear in his later work. He wrote the pamphlets in the course of a pamphlet debate with Samuel Seabury in 1774 and 1775. The Continental Congress had recommended measures to cease all trade with Great Britain in order to force Britain to restore colonial privileges. Seabury attacked the measures, and Hamilton defended them.[2]

A study of these argumentative pamphlets reveals the same techniques of persuasian that Hamilton used in later years as a writer and as an orator.[3] When judged according to Aristotelian standards of criticism, his techniques merit examination and study of the student of speech, even though his medium was written rather than oral.

The Previous Criticism

The literary critics, biographers, and historians who have commented on the

[1] The date of Hamilton's birth is uncertain; the most generally accepted date is January 11, 1757.

[2] Alexander Hamilton, *A Full Vindication of the Measures of the Congress, from the Calumnies of their Enemies; in Answer to a Letter, Under the Signature of A. W. Farmer. Whereby his Sophistry is Exposed, his Cavils Confuted, his Artifices Detected, and his Wit Ridiculed; In a General Address to the Inhabitants of America, and a Particular Address to the Farmers of the Province of New York*, New York: Printed by James Rivington, 1774.

Alexander Hamilton, *The Farmer Refuted: or, A More Impartial and Comprehensive View of the Dispute Between Great-Britain and the Colonies, Intended as a Further Vindication of the Congress: In Answer to a Letter, From A. W. Farmer, Intitled A View of the Controversy Between Great Britain and her Colonies: Including, A Mode of Determining the Present Disputes Finally and Effectually, Etc.*, New York: Printed by James Rivington, 1775.

[3] Bower Aly, *The Rhetoric of Alexander Hamilton*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.

pamphlets have found them remarkable, first, because they were written by a young undergraduate at King's College; and second, because the maturity of thought, reasoning, and foresight led even the president of King's College to attribute the anonymously published pamphlets to older and more learned men, especially to John Jay and Governor Livingston.[4] The tenor of the comments of many historians may be observed in the remarks of George Ticknor Curtis:

> There are displayed in these papers a power of reasoning and sarcasm, a knowledge of principles of government and of the English Constitution, and a grasp of the merits of the whole controversy, that would have done honor to any man at any age, and in a youth of seventeen are wonderful. To say that they evince a precocity of intellect gives no idea of their main characteristics. They show great maturity—a more remarkable maturity than has ever been exhibited by any other person, at so early an age, in the same department of thought.[5]

From a somewhat more rhetorical point of view, Bailey[6] and Oliver[7] note that Hamilton completely changed style in his appeal to the farmers, and became simple, direct, and colloquial. Other writers comment only upon the terse and pointed style, and upon Hamilton's remarkable argumentative ability.

A few writers have mentioned his use of logic. Atherton finds that the pamphlets contain "unanswerable logic,"[8] and Bailey states that they evince a "power ably to discharge the exactions of sustained argumentative dissertation on difficult themes."[9] On the other hand, Oliver observes that "the premises are not reasoned but accepted, as we should expect in the case of a boy of eighteen; but nevertheless, rhetorical exaggeration and turgid generalities play but a small part."[10]

Literary critics, biographers, and historians have both praised and censured the pamphlets, but have not analyzed them rhetorically. In general writers have regarded them as the early work of a youth of genius, and not as a force in the thought of the time. It is the purpose of this study to criticize the pamphlets rhetorically.

The Character of the Audience

Hamilton's audience belonged to a period of tension and anxiety, at home and abroad.[11] During the years immediately preceding the First Continental Congress of 1774, relations between Great Britain and the colonies were strained; among the separate colonies there existed prejudices and jealousies frequently found among independent countries; even the people in a single province disagreed on many problems, particularly on the question of loyalty to the parent state. This lack of unity manifested itself in discussions, arguments, outbursts of mob violence, and expressions of sentiment in newspapers and pamphlets. The ordinary medium for lengthy arguments was the pamphlet, and the anonymous pamphlet was the fashion of the times.[12]

Prior to the First Continental Congress, there was little talk of independence even among the leaders of colonial sympathy. As a result of the measures[13] imposed by the British Parliament, three parties developed: first, the ultra-Tories, staunch supporters of the crown, who

[4] Ralph Edward Bailey, *An American Colossus: The Singular Career of Alexander Hamilton* (Boston, 1933), p. 43.
[5] George Ticknor Curtis, *Constitutional History of the United States* (1889-96), I, 274.
[6] Bailey, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
[7] Frederick S. Oliver, *Alexander Hamilton: An Essay on American Union* (1920), p. 29.
[8] Gertrude Atherton, *The Conqueror* (1934), p. 137.
[9] Bailey, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
[10] Oliver, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
[11] Curtis, *op. cit.*, I, 278.
[12] Henry Jones Ford, *Alexander Hamilton* (1925), p. 29.
[13] The Navigation Acts, the stamp tax, a standing army, and a tax on many commodities, including tea, which the colonists were forced to buy from Britain.

approved the measures; second, the liberal Tories, who were not in favor of the British measures, at the same time being opposed to any radical measures by the colonists for redress; and third, the Whigs, who violently opposed the British measures and advocated radical action on the part of the colonists. When the recommendations[14] of the First Continental Congress became known, the liberal Tories, being unable to approve the measures, were forced to join the ultra-Tories in supporting Great Britain.

However, all who did not heartily approve of the measures of the Congress were not violently opposed to them, and sympathies were not evenly or sharply divided. The great majority of people were neither Whigs nor Tories, and "could be regarded as indifferent, ready to stampede and rush along with the successful part."[15] The majority consisted primarily of middle-class people—farmers, merchants, shopkeepers, carpenters—who were more concerned with the means of making a living than with political affiliations, independence, and tyranny. Although the apparent indifference of the majority would seem to have given both Tories and Whigs an equal chance to win the support of the indifferent majority, the Whigs had to consider an additional factor. The great body of colonists had for generations regarded themselves as loyal subjects of the crown of England, and were in the habit of paying allegiance to the King and to Parliament. Both parties encountered the indifference and inertia of the masses, but the Whigs had perhaps the more difficult task of breaking down the old habits of doing and thinking as royal subjects in order to convert the majority to the new principles of their party.

Hamilton's audience was the majority group of middle-class people—a more or less indifferent group of industrious and intelligent people who were far from wealthy. He addressed the pamphlets particularly to the farmers and merchants in the province of New York.

[14] A nonimportation, nonexportation, nonconsumption policy toward Great Britain.

[15] Claude Halstead Van Tyne, *The Loyalists in the American Revolution* (1902), pp. 2-3.

The Pamphlets

There are four outstanding characteristics of Hamilton's powers of persuasion revealed in the pamphlets as a whole, which merit at least a brief description.

I. The first is an admirable adaptation to the audience in matters of style, organization, and evidence. The simple and direct style, particularly in the special address to the farmers, is well adapted to the clear and concise language understood by the farmers and merchants whom Hamilton addressed. The use of rhetorical questions, short sentences, and first and second personal pronouns adds immeasurably to the communicative quality of the style.

The pamphlets are organized around a few major ideas supported by a wealth of evidence. For example, *A Full Vindication* attempts to show that the measures of Congress have the sanction (1) of justice and (2) of sound policy. In support of the latter argument, Hamilton organizes his evidence around three points: (a) the necessity of the times required the measures; (b) the measures are not the source of greater evils than those they propose to remedy; and (c) they have the probability of success. The evidence offered in support of the arguments is drawn, in a large measure, not from higher authority, but from the immediate experience of the audience. Hamilton appeals to their unfortunate experience in former dealings with Great Britain, to their knowledge of similar negotiations between Canada and Great Britain, and to their common sense. The appeal to motives of self-interest underlies both pamphlets, and

may have been Hamilton's method of reaching an indifferent majority—through their pocketbooks—for he reasons in terms of dollars and cents for sheep, grain, flax, and all kinds of household utilities.

II. There is a notable absence of pathetic proof in the pamphlets. In view of the lack of any feelings of unity or national pride among the colonies, Hamilton may have avoided appeals to patriotism and love of country. The one pathetic appeal which he does use is an appeal to fear—fear of slavery, oppression, and tyranny from Britain; but it is a fear that Hamilton supports with logic and evidence—in other words, a reasonable fear.

III. The predominance of logical proof as a mode of persuasion is apparent in both pamphlets. There are two general characteristics of constructive proof which should be noted. First, Hamilton starts with some maxim, fact, or belief acceptable to his audience, and reasons from it, most frequently by deduction. To illustrate, he begins one argument with the maxim that "in a civil society, it is the duty of each particular branch to promote, not only the good of the whole community, but the good of every other particular branch."[16] From the maxim he reasons deductively to the conclusion that the West Indies, by their failure to express their objection to Britain's tyrannous treatment of the American colonies, have failed to promote the good of another branch of society, and that, therefore, the measures of the Congress are not unjust to the West Indies.

The second general characteristic of constructive proof is the use of cause and effect relationships. Hamilton has designed both pamphlets to show that the effect of noncompliance with the measures of Congress would be slavery, accompanied by heavy taxation, oppression, loss of civil and religious liberty, and that the effect of compliance would be the redress of grievances. He further shows the effect of the loss of colonial trade in England, as well as in other countries, which would force Britain to concede to colonial petitions.

Hamilton himself expresses his dependence on logical proof: "'Tis my maxim to let the plain naked truth speak for itself; and if men won't listen to it, 'tis their own fault: they must be contented to suffer for it."[17] Although this statement might seem to be ethical proof, it expresses Hamilton's stated preference for logical methods of persuasion. It also illustrates one of Hamilton's assumptions—that is, that his audience would be more subject to persuasion by logical argument than by pathetic appeals.

IV. Hamilton's procedure in refutation is a distinct characteristic of the pamphlets. The procedure is largely a skillful interweaving of constructive and refutative argument which renders the constructive argument exceedingly forceful. Hamilton, almost without exception, carefully summarizes or quotes the argument of the opponent that he wishes to refute, states the position that he himself takes, proceeds to an annihilation of his opponent's argument by attacks from several points of view, and then returns to his own argument, supporting it with an overwhelming amount of evidence. This procedure is again and again evident in the pamphlets, and a précis of one of the arguments from *The Farmer Refuted* may serve as an illustration.

Seabury states that the rebellious spirit of the colonists, together with the petitions sent to the King, and the measures proposed by the late Congress, make the

[16] Alexander Hamilton, *A Full Vindication* (1774), p. 9.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

petitions little short of ultimatums, and will result only in arousing Britain to subject the colonists by force. Then the colonists will be in a worse condition than before. After summarizing the argument, Hamilton states that it is chiefly idle talk, and proceeds to refute it.

In the first place, Britain will not go to war because the people of England do not want it and because the British treasury cannot afford it. In the second place, if Britain does go to war, she cannot win. The financial expense involved in carrying on a successful war on a foreign soil is too great for the already over-taxed people of England. Moreover, England has too many old enemies who might take advantage of her weakened condition to recover former losses. The colonists can raise an army which will be fired by motives of self-preservation, protection of homeland, and security of liberty. The colonial army will have the distinct advantage of familiarity with their own country, and boundless natural resources within close range.

However, even if Britain emerges victorious from a war with the colonists, America will be of little use to her. The war will have created animosity, enmity, and dissension between the people of the two countries. America will be in a weakened condition as a result of the war—her resources damaged or destroyed, and her continent debilitated. She will be economically ruined and unable to pay annually the millions in sterling to Great Britain as she has done in former years. Moreover, Britain, in order to make America of any use to her, will have to finance the reconstruction of the colonies with money she does not have. In short, America will become a liability instead of an asset.

After this attack on Seabury's argument, Hamilton turns to his own contention, that the measures proposed by Congress will cause Britain to restore the colonists' just liberties and privileges as English freemen, in the support of which he offers a wealth of evidence.

The Effect

This study has pointed out Hamilton's adaptation to the audience in style, organization, evidence, and arguments, but it is more difficult to determine the effectiveness of the pamphlets. Curtis states that the pamphlets produced a great effect. "Their influence," he says, "in bringing the public mind to the point of resistance to the mother country was important and extensive."[18] Curtis, however, makes no further comment and offers no evidence.

Concerning Hamilton's effectiveness with his audience, it is impossible to ascertain even the number of people who read the pamphlets, much less the number convinced by them, because forces other than the arguments presented in the pamphlets were operating to bring the controversy to its crisis. Nevertheless, the replies of Tory writers seem to indicate that the pamphlets did produce some effect. Seabury immediately answered Hamilton's first pamphlet; but *The Farmer Refuted*, the second pamphlet, remained unanswered for many months until finally Isaac Wilkins, a friend to Samuel Seabury, replied with a pamphlet entitled *The Republican Dissected*, which was in press when Rivington's printing office was destroyed.[19] The loyalists even approached Hamilton with liberal offers if he would change his opinions and support the British side, but he refused their offers.[20]

If it were possible to characterize in a single word the nature of Hamilton's persuasion as exhibited in the pamphlet's that word would be "reason."

[18] Curtis, *op. cit.*, I, 274-275.
[19] Charles Evans, ed., *American Bibliography* (Chicago, 1903-34), V, 140.
[20] John T. Morse, *The Life of Alexander Hamilton* Boston, 1876), I, 16-17.

The dependence on logical proof is a dependence on reason. In pathetic proof the emotional appeal is to fear, but it is a fear that Hamilton supports by reason and logic. In ethical proof Hamilton attempts to establish himself as a man of reason and judgment addressing an audience of people who respect those qualities.

Hamilton, although relying largely upon logical proof, made concessions to the influence of emotions and character. Hence, the two pamphlets, *A Full Vindication* and *The Farmer Refuted*, are examples of persuasive discourse which merit approval when judged according to those Aristotelian standards of criticism which suggest that the proof supplied by logic or reason would be sufficient if audiences were not subject to persuasion through their emotions and by the character of the speaker.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY, REFORMER AND SPEAKER

ELAINE E. McDAVITT
University of Michigan

THE Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution, enacted in August, 1920, reads as follows:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.

It seems ironical that this act, realizing the hopes and dreams of Susan B. Anthony,[1] who had dedicated over fifty years to the emancipation and enfranchisement of women, was not passed until fourteen years after her death.

Like many another great reformer in history, Susan B. Anthony did not live to see the fruition of her work, but she did achieve recognition during her lifetime as a pioneer woman reformer and speaker. We shall here follow—briefly—her career, inquire into the forces that influenced her in that career, observe some of her characteristics as a speaker, and survey the reactions of the contemporary press.

[1] The most valuable treatment of her life is Ida H. Harper's, *Life and Works of Susan B. Anthony* (Volumes I, II, Indianapolis, 1898; Volume III, 1908). The first two volumes, completed during Miss Anthony's lifetime, present an exhaustive study of her activities as well as innumerable press reactions to her public appearances. The third volume, completed after her death in 1906, contains a collection of eulogies that appeared in leading newspapers.

I

Career

Mathilda J. Gage in *A History of Woman Suffrage* has said: "The prolonged slavery of woman is the darkest page in human history." For centuries, woman was regarded with little more consideration than a slave. In her father's house she learned to cook and sew, and do his bidding. Because she was trained to believe that marriage was the only suitable end of woman's life, at an early age she acquired a new master in the person of a husband to whom she bore children and for whom she kept a house, seldom venturing into the world beyond that house, never venturing to offer an opinion on the legal, economic, or social activities of her time.

If she did not marry, she became a kind of menial in the home of a male relative, a thing of pity, unwanted and unrespected. If she had to earn a living, dressmaking, teaching, or taking in boarders were the only means available to her. Her earnings in these capacities were meagre, and her position was negligible.

In America, women's rights had been

championed as early as Revolutionary days when Abigail Adams had beseeched her husband, John Adams, to make a place for women in the Constitution of the United States. In 1828 Frances Wright dared to address a meeting in Cincinnati. The decade of the 1830's witnessed the first appearances on the public platform of such women as Lucretia Mott and Angelina Grimké in behalf of the abolition of slavery. By 1832 their development as public speakers had focused attention upon the question of whether women were to be allowed on the platform.

Ten years later women were hired as reform agents, and traveled about the country giving speeches. Although their activities were encouraged by William Lloyd Garrison, William Ellery Channing and Wendell Phillips, the approval of these liberals did not quiet the fierce vituperations of certain newspapers and pulpits, which believed firmly that women's place was in the home.

Certain women resented this attitude. They began to resent, too, the laws that did not permit women to hold property, the refusal of universities to admit women to candidacies for degrees, and the low salaries that women teachers received while performing the same duties as men.

In 1840, a World's Anti-Slavery Convention was held in London. Women delegates from the United States, including Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott, were refused admittance to the floor of the auditorium and were relegated to the balcony. In the conversation of these women delegates as they returned to their hotel that evening, the first seeds of a woman's suffrage movement were planted.

The first meeting in its behalf was held in the home of Elizabeth Cady Stanton in Seneca Falls, New York, in July, 1848. After two days it adjourned to meet in Rochester on August 2. Susan Anthony did not attend this convention, but her father, mother, and sister Mary were present and signed the declaration demanding equal rights for women. Their enthusiasm for the cause and for its leader, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, had a pronounced effect on Susan.

She was affected also by the restlessness and fervor of the time. More than eighty thousand men had gone to California in search of gold; telegraphs and railroads were being rapidly constructed; and the slavery question was acquiring greater significance. It was not surprising that the narrow confines of the schoolroom should seem like prison walls to an educated, public-spirited young woman, and that she should become absorbed with the thought, "What service can I render humanity; what can I do to help right the wrongs of society?"

She first sought the answer in work for the Temperance movement and then in the Antislavery movement, through which she at last met Elizabeth Cady Stanton in 1851. Mrs. Stanton was immediately charmed by the tall, shy Quaker girl, and here began a friendship and association that lasted for many years. Susan B. Anthony had found her life's work and had begun her career in public life.

In April, 1852, the Sons of Temperance invited the Daughters of Temperance to send delegates to a convention at Albany. Susan Anthony's credentials as a delegate from Rochester were accepted, but when she rose to speak, she was informed by the presiding officer that "the sisters were not invited there to speak but to listen and learn." Miss Anthony and three other delegates left the hall. On the advice of Lydia Mott they held a meeting of their own and organized the Woman's State Temperance Convention.

At the first meeting Susan Anthony

was expected to present the opening address as well as to preside. Shy and reluctant, she was persuaded to do so by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who said:

> I will gladly do all in my power to help you. Come and stay with me, and I will write the best lecture I can for you. I have no doubt a little practice will make you an admirable speaker. Dress loosely, take a great deal of exercise, be particular about your diet, and sleep enough. The body has great influence on the mind. In your meetings, if attacked, be cool and good-natured, for if you are simple and truth loving, no sophistry can confound you.

Susan Anthony gratefully accepted the offer. Thus began a collaboration which these two women continued for many years. By the application of Elizabeth Cady Stanton's facile style to Susan Anthony's arguments and statistics, there resulted speeches that were able representations of the cause of woman's rights.

Susan Anthony attended her first Woman's Rights Convention on September 8, 1852. From that time until her death in 1906, she was a devoted and ardent champion of this cause. When, at this meeting, Mrs. Smith, fashionable Bostonian elaborately dressed in a low-necked gown, was nominated for president, Susan Anthony spoke out boldly and said that nobody so dressed should represent the earnest, hard-working women of the country for whom they were demanding equal rights. She won her point, and Lucretia Mott was made president. Susan Anthony had dared to say what others had only dared to think.

Since the days when she had presided over the school room during her fifteen years as a teacher, she had been familiar with the injustices meted out to the women in that profession. In August, 1853, she attended a teachers' convention at Rochester. Over five hundred teachers were in attendance; at least two-thirds of them were women. For two days Susan Anthony sat there, and not one of the women dared to speak. Toward the close of the second day's sessions the subject under consideration was "Why the profession of teacher is not as much respected as that of lawyer, doctor or minister." After two hours she could bear it no longer. When she rose and said, "Mr. President," a bombshell would not have created greater emotion. For the first time in all history a woman's voice was heard in a teachers' convention. The question of whether she should be heard precipitated a debate that lasted half an hour. She stood the entire time, fearing to lose the floor if she sat down. At last, given permission to speak, she said:

> It seems to me you fail to comprehend the cause of which you complain. Do you not see that so long as society says woman has not brains enough to be a doctor, lawyer, or minister, but has plenty to be a teacher, every man of you who condescends to teach, tacitly admits before all Israel and the sun that he has no more brains than a woman?

She had intended to say also that the only way to place teaching on a level with other professions was either to admit women to them or to exclude them from teaching, but her trembling limbs would no longer sustain her.

During the next few years she developed more confidence in her ability to appear before the public. She journeyed from town to town to organize associations, to make financial arrangements, and to engage halls for meetings; and she spoke briefly on programs with other performers. To present a resolution or make a five-minute speech became an easy thing, but a request to speak for an hour before a teachers' association in August, 1856, on "Coeducation" kept Miss Anthony awake for many nights. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, coming to the rescue, said, "Come here and I will do what I can to help you with your address if you will hold the baby and make the pudding." She kept her promise. When

the address was completed Susan Anthony felt that in order to prove the absolute equality of women with men she ought to present this as an oration instead of reading it as an essay. She paced up and down for hours trying to commit the speech to memory, but all in vain. It was impossible for her, then or later, ever to memorize exact words. For this reason most of her speeches were given from notes, never being presented twice in quite the same way. Although Elizabeth Cady Stanton continued to be of assistance to her in the preparation of some speeches, there were no more carefully worded orations to memorize.

Conventions were abandoned during the Civil War years, and Susan became a leading force in the war work of an organization known as the Woman's National Loyal League. After the war she was influential in uniting the Anti-Slavery Society with the Woman's Right Society, a merger known as the American Equal Rights Association, for, with the abolition of slavery, the prime object of both organizations became universal suffrage. However, when the Fourteenth Amendment enfranchised Negro men, this organization was ended, and the American Woman's Suffrage Association was formed on May 14, 1870.

In 1872 Susan Anthony and fourteen other woman suffragists, supported by some of the ablest Constitutional lawyers in the country, claimed the right to vote under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, which did not mention sex in awarding the privileges of franchise. Consequently, on November 1, 1872, these women cast their first votes and were immediately served warrants. In the interesting and significant trial, which dragged out for a year, Susan Anthony stood her ground. The trial was, in a measure, a farce, for Judge Hunt ignored the right of every citizen to a trial by jury when he "demanded" a verdict of "guilty." But the trial of Susan Anthony had lifted the question of woman suffrage from one of grievance to one of Constitutional law. It had been proved that further legislation was needed to secure equal rights for women.

Opportunity to earn much-needed money for her campaign came to her in an offer from the Redpath Lyceum Bureau, which, by 1870, had become a marked feature of literary life. In the decade of the 1870's she spoke in all parts of the country under both the Redpath auspices and those of the Slayton Lyceum Bureau. Her speeches, "Woman Wants Bread, Not the Ballot," and "Social Purity," established her at last as a speaker as well as a reformer.

By 1880 her hard work on the lecture platform was beginning to show results. More and more supporters were gathering to her cause, and great satisfaction came in February, 1887, twenty years after she had made her first Kansas campaign, when municipal suffrage was conferred on the women of Kansas. A second triumph came in 1890 when Wyoming was admitted into the Union with franchise for women, despite a long and bitter struggle. In 1893 suffrage was granted to the women of Colorado. More progress was made in 1895 when Utah was admitted, without controversy, with the same provision Wyoming had exacted five years before.

That complete suffrage was not attained in a greater number of states was a source of disappointment to Susan Anthony in her last years, yet she must have found encouragement in the legal, educational, and industrial gains that women enjoyed as a result of her devotion of fifty years to their cause. The influence of women increased in every direction, the number of women in colleges approached that of men, the number of girls in the high schools exceeded

that of boys, women under liberal laws acquired property, and others enjoyed financial independence. The American Woman's Suffrage Association, which she founded with a handful of women and nursed through years of weakness and poverty, had expanded into a great organization with affiliated branches in nearly every state. Women of all classes, creeds, and interests had entered the movement for franchise.

Her last message to a convention of women suffragists concluded with these words: "The fight must not cease; you must see that it does not stop!" To Anna Howard Shaw, her devoted friend and disciple, Susan Anthony passed the torch. And Anna Howard Shaw carried on the work as she had promised at Susan Anthony's bedside during the long hours before the latter's death on March 13, 1906.

II

Background Influences

A study of the ancestry, home, and childhood of Susan B. Anthony reveals the significance of these influences in her development as a reformer and a speaker.

On her father's side she was descended from English stock that had first migrated to America in 1634, and eventually settled in the village of Adams in the Berkshire Hills of Massachusetts. Her father's family were Quakers, faithful upholders of the tenets of that church. Daniel Anthony, father of Susan, received an education through the efforts of his mother and returned to his local village to teach school. Among his pupils was Lucy Reade, whom he married in 1817.

Lucy Reade, mother of Susan, was also descended of English stock. Her father, Daniel Reade, fought in the Revolutionary War and was a member of the Massachusetts legislature. The Reades were firm Baptists until Daniel became interested in the teachings of John Murray, founder of the Universalist faith. Reade was one of the first persons in his vicinity to disbelieve in a literal hell. Although his wife "wore out the skin on her knees," praying for the salvation of his soul, he remained firm in his Universalist beliefs until his death at eighty-four. Because of her father's unorthodox beliefs, Lucy was brought up in a liberal manner; she was given singing lessons, allowed to attend parties and dances, and to wear pretty clothes.

When Daniel Anthony married Lucy Reade, the Quakers threatened to read Daniel out of meeting. However, a dispensation was finally made, and Lucy learned to love the religion of the Friends, but she never became a member of the church, declaring she was not good enough.

Susan B. Anthony, the second of eight children, was born on February 15, 1820. Like other girls of her generation, she was brought up to cook and sew and care for the house and younger children, but she was more fortunate than most of these "other girls"; she was sent to school, for the Quakers believed in equal education of men and women.

First, she attended an old-fashioned district school. Later, her father operated a private school in a room in his brick store, employed the best teachers and admitted only those children whom he wished to associate with his own. When she was fifteen, Susan, herself, taught the younger children during the summer months.

When she was eighteen, Susan was sent to a boarding school near Philadelphia, where Deborah Moulson had opened a "Seminary for Females." The announcement said, "The inculcations of the Principles of Humility, Morality, and a love of Virtue will receive particular attention." Susan must have been

greatly influenced by the austere Deborah, who was said to have been a cultured and estimable woman but to have represented the spirit of that age toward childhood, liberally administering reproof and as conscientiously withholding praise.

During this year Susan wrote many letters to her family, but each letter that she wrote had to be copied on a slate and then censored, corrected, and recopied before it could be sent. A letter was often five or six days in preparation, and no opportunity was given for developing a facile style. In later years she attributed the stilted style in which she wrote her speeches to these laborious letters she was forced to write in school. In order to escape from this artificial method of writing, she cultivated extemporaneous speaking, using only a brief outline.

Her antipathy to drink was probably acquired at an early age. Her father kept a store where he sold intoxicating liquors; but, when he saw a man frozen to death by the side of the road, with a nearby tell-tale jug, he determined to sell no more liquor. He also became interested in the Temperance movement, a movement which Susan supported firmly when she grew up.

Her interest in reform movements became intensified in 1845. While teaching in Canajoharie, she became absorbed in the Temperance movement, and while visiting at her parents' home in Rochester, her attention was turned to the Anti-slavery movement, an issue of controversy in the Quaker church, which finally caused Daniel Anthony, a firm believer in Abolition, to transfer his loyalty to the Unitarian church.

Finally, as the beliefs and ideals which heredity and environment had sowed in her heart and soul increasingly cried for opportunity in expression and action, school teaching became tedious and monotonous to her. Inevitably, therefore, she left this work in which she had been successful for fifteen years; and in 1852, embarked upon a career as spokesman for several reform movements, a career in which she was backed by her father, financially and spiritually. In her subsequent activities it is possible to see the Quakerism of the Anthonys, who had believed in temperance, education, and adherence to uprighteous living, the liberalism and tolerance of her Universalist grandfather, Daniel Reade, and the sound ideals of morals and virtue of the austere Deborah. Perhaps the greatest influence in all she was and in all she did was her father, Daniel Anthony, who had her to school, encouraged her in her activities as a teacher, impressed her with the evils of drink and with the importance of adherence to beliefs of right, and who finally gave her the unwavering courage to pursue her work in reform.

III

Some Characteristics as a Speaker

Susan Anthony was a tall, slim woman with an abundance of brown hair, that turned silver gray in her later years. She always wore it parted in the middle and drawn tightly back, covering the upper portion of her ears. Her grey-blue eyes were keen and bright behind her gold-rimmed spectacles. Except for a few months when other suffragists persuaded her to wear the Bloomer costume, her dress was always much the same—black silk or satin with a touch of lace around the neck and sleeves. The only color she ever wore in public was a shawl of red silk crepe edged with a long heavy-knotted fringe. This shawl became a kind of battle flag for the suffrage movement. One time she appeared without it in Washington, D.C., and the reporters who were present sent her a note, saying,

"No red shawl, no report." She laughed and sent to her hotel for it.

For the audiences, composed of men and women of varying backgrounds and beliefs, Susan Anthony had one message. Whatever the subject of her address may have been, the fundamental purpose of the speech was always the same. From the time she became associated with the cause of Woman's Rights, it was always paramount in her thoughts. This sincere devotion to her beliefs, which so colored her personality, was largely responsible for her success in lifting the "cause" to a plane of universal respect. Through sheer devotion to this cause Susan Anthony won the admiration of all classes of people. Through her understanding of the problems of the women of her day she won for herself warm affection.

Mrs. Harper has said of her, "She struck her blows straight from the shoulder, called things by their right names, was absolutely fearless, accepted no compromises, was never silenced, never deceived, never turned aside from her purpose."

Her speech on "Social Purity," illustrates these factors. Men and women of the late nineteenth century may have been shocked to hear her call a spade a spade, but the wealth of statistical material, coupled with innumerable examples of the social evils to which women of the period were being submitted, could not have failed to hold the audiences and must have sent them home with much to ponder over.

Although she was never melodramatic or sentimental to the point of being maudlin, her power as a speaker was enhanced by her use of example and statistical material which had an emotional appeal for her listeners. Women were moved by the stories of the sufferings of other women who had been subjugated throughout the ages. Men were impressed by her amazing mass of statistics.

Newspapers and contemporary critics alike never ceased to praise her use of logic. In an editorial which appeared the day after her death, the *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle* said:

> Miss Anthony was a wonderfully persuasive public speaker. She was in no sense declamatory. She did not deal in rhetoric or the flowers of fancy. Her speech was as direct, as clearcut, and as convincing as an axiom. Her logic admitted no refutation, granting her premises. She not only herself saw the connection but had the power of making others see it and in the fewest possible words.

IV

Reactions of the Contemporary Press

The press notices concerning Susan Anthony's earliest appearances were usually derogatory. This reaction was probably inevitable in view of the disapproval of the causes for which she spoke and of antipathy to women speakers in general, but it must also be remembered that she was at first shy and self conscious and completely without training or experience as a public speaker.

In one of these early newspaper accounts she was assailed as "a maiden lady who claimed to understand the problems of a married woman." In another, her voice was compared to a hurdy-gurdy, and in appearance she was said to be "lean and cadaverous . . . with the proportions of a file." Other early newspapers, however, admitted that her enunciation was clear and distinct, her style earnest and impressive, and her arguments strong and stimulating.

Time, and perhaps her development as a speaker, modified these comments. The large audiences she attracted during her years with the Redpath Lyceum Bureau indicated not only the softening of public opinion toward the work for woman suffrage but also a definite improvement in her ability as a speaker. When she spoke in Cincinnati on February 12, 1889, the *Commercial Gazette*

carried the following comment:

> . . . if she did not succeed in gaining many proselytes to her well-known views regarding woman's emancipation, she certainly reaped the reward of presenting the arguments in an interesting and logical manner. Every neatly turned point was received with applause and that good natured laughter that carries with it not a little of the element of conviction.

At the time of her death newspapers from New York to California recognized her accomplishments. Countless references were made to her work for temperance, abolition of slavery, and women's rights. Many paid tribute to the improved position of woman in society. Some held hope for eventual enfranchisement and prophesied that Susan's dream would some day be realized.

The day after her death Dorothy Dix wrote the following for the *New York Evening Journal:*

> She [Susan B. Anthony] found the woman, who attempted to speak in public, no matter how eloquent, or how sincere, or how important the message she had to bring, hissed and mobbed and lampooned. She leaves vast audiences listening to woman orators and applauding them to the echo.

The story of Susan Anthony's activities in the movement of reform demonstrates her development as a reformer and a speaker. The contrast between the position of women in society at the beginning of her work and their position at the time of her death in 1906 is indicative of her successful attainment of a foremost position among pioneer women—a position attained largely through her work as a speaker for reform. It does not seem presumptuous to conclude that her name will be remembered at least as long as the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution survives.

EXPERIMENTAL AND STATISTICAL RESEARCH IN GENERAL SPEECH:

II. Speakers, Speeches, and Audiences

HOWARD GILKINSON
University of Minnesota

A RECENTLY published survey of research in speech contains references to a considerable number of statistical and experimental studies concerned with the behavior of speakers and audiences and the analysis of speeches.[1] It is the purpose of this article to give an overview of this field of investigation, to describe methods of measurement and types of research, and to discuss some general trends.

[1] Howard Gilkinson, *Outlines of Research in General Speech*, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1943.

Recording the Responses of an Audience

An examination of the studies in this area shows that four distinguishable kinds of criterion indexes have been employed to record, or measure, the influence of a speaker upon an audience.

Attitude Scales. A great deal of research in general psychology has gone into the development of various devices for the measurement of social attitudes, and a number of these instruments have been employed in the study of oral prop-

aganda. Knower[2] used a scale for the measurement of attitudes toward Prohibition which had been developed by Smith and Thurstone. Lomas[3] employed the Thurstone method in constructing scales for the measurement of attitudes toward the New Deal. The items in such an instrument have specific reference to some particular topic, such as Militarism or Prohibition. Generalized scales, the items of which are so stated that they can refer to almost any social institution or proposed action, have been developed by Remmers and colleagues.[4] One of these was employed by Monroe in some of his research on audience reaction.[5] Another measure, developed by Likert and based on summated ratings, was employed by Wilke in a study of the value of different modes of communication.[6]

Opinion Polls. Simple polling methods, such as those used currently by Gallup, have been employed in some studies. The audience is asked to vote on the central proposition under consideration before and after hearing a speech, and statistical methods are employed to discover if significant changes have occurred in any of the categories of response. A variation of this method is seen in the shift-of-opinion ballot which has been used by Woodward and Millson to study the effects of debate and discussion.[7] The members of the audience vote on the topic under consideration before the debate or discussion, and again afterwards, at which time they may indicate that they are more strongly affirmative or more strongly negative than they were at the time of the first ballot.

Retention Tests. True-false, sentence-completion, and multiple-choice types of retention tests have been employed to measure the amount of detailed content of speeches remembered by audiences.[8]

Ratings. Subjects have been asked in some investigations to rate speeches, or express judgments about them, with reference to such qualities as general effectiveness, interestingness, convincingness, understandability, suitability, and desirability.

It is important to note some essential differences among these various methods of recording the responses of an audience. The distinguishing characteristic of the attitude scale is measurement, *i.e.*, it purports to express degrees or quantities of favorableness and unfavorableness of attitude on a scale of mathematically definable units. This is particularly true of those instruments which are constructed by the method of equal-appearing-intervals (Thurstone scales and generalized scales). The simple polling devices, on the other hand, do not measure anything; they only sample opinion on the basis of a limited number of categorical responses (yes, no, and ?). Variations in degree or intensity of opinion are not taken into consideration. The formulas of the shift-of-opinion ballot are intended to give quantitative expression to changes of group opinion, hence represent a type of measurement. Retention test scores also provide crude quantitative indexes, not of opinion, but of intellectual content. There are no doubt

[2] Franklin Knower, "Experimental Studies of Changes of Attitude," *Journal of Social Psychology*, VI (1935), 315-347.

[3] Charles Lomas, An Experimental Study of the Effect of Provocative Language on Audience Reaction to Political Speeches, Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1940.

[4] H. H. Remmers, "Generalized Attitude Scale—Studies in Social-Psychological Measurements," *Bulletin of Purdue University*, 35, *Studies in Higher Education*, XXVI (Dec., 1934).

[5] Alan Monroe, "The Measurement and Analysis of Audience Reaction to Student Speakers—Studies in Attitude Changes," *Bulletin of Purdue University*, 38, *Studies in Higher Education*, XXXII (Dec., 1937).

[6] Walter Wilke, "Experimental Comparison of the Speech, the Radio, and the Printed Page as Propaganda Devices," *Archives of Psychology*, No. 169 (1934).

[7] W. A. D. Millson, "Problems in Measuring Audience Reaction," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XVIII (1932), 621-637.

[8] Ray Ehrensberger, An Experimental Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Certain Forms of Emphasis in Public Speaking, Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1937.

other psychological differences among these various types of criteria. Ratings, for example, call for a direct evaluation of the speaker (or speech) by the listener. He is asked, "Do you think this is an effective speech, convincing speech, a pleasant style, etc.?" Retention tests and measured changes of attitudes, on the other hand, represent a more indirect type of evaluation.

Perhaps it is not wise to form any hard and fast judgments at present on the relative merits of the different methods of measuring or recording the effects of speeches upon the opinions of audiences. Much depends upon the specific uses to which an instrument is to be put in a given study. The advanced development of the Thurstone scale has naturally given it high preference among experimenters. It has one serious drawback, however; prepared scales are available on only a limited number of topics, and the construction of such an instrument is itself a rather formidable research project. Possibly the generalized scale, or the Likert scale, will prove to be a solution for this problem. The simple polling methods may serve very well in studies which require nothing more than a direct comparison of audience opinion before and after a speech, but the data is susceptible to only a very limited statistical analysis.

There appear to be some marked differences of viewpoint about the technical merits of the shift-of-opinion ballot. Monroe has published some favorable evidence on its reliability and validity.[9] On the other hand, Henrikson[10] has criticized the method because it requires the subject to compare his opinion after the discussion with that held before the discussion, a rather complex judgment. The objection is a theoretical one, but it is pertinent, and it suggests that the method could be used only in experiments involving a short interval of time between the first and second ballot.

Types of Research

It would be impossible to mention here all of the statistical and experimental studies of audience reaction. Following are some of them, classified according to the purpose of the investigation.

General Studies. A number of studies have been carried out for the general purpose of measuring and describing the effects of public address upon the attitudes of the audience. The investigation by Willey and Rice[11] of the reactions of Dartmouth College students to a speech on the doctrine of evolution by William Jennings Bryan was a pioneer effort in this field. Qualitative data indicated general admiration of the speaker's oratorical ability accompanied by skepticism about the logical value of his arguments. Substantial changes of attitude toward the theory of evolution occurred among approximately one-fourth of the subjects. In another general study, Chen[12] found that lectures on the Sino-Japanese controversy over Manchuria had a measurable influence over the attitudes of American college students, whereas lectures on Chinese and Japanese art had little or no influence. Gardner[13] found that a series of presentations (lecture, story, and chalk-talk) had the effect of causing an audience to diverge more and more from their original attitude on the subject discussed and in the

[9] Alan Monroe, "The Statistical Reliability and Validity of the Shift-of-Opinion Ballot," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIII (1937), 577-585.

[10] Ernest Henrikson, "The Audience Reaction Ballot: An Evaluation," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIV (1938), 48-61.

[11] M. M. Willey and S. A. Rice, "William Jennings Bryan as a Social Force," *Journal of Social Forces*, II (1924), 338-344.

[12] W. K. C. Chen, "The Influence of Oral Propaganda Material Upon Students' Attitudes," *Archives of Psychology*, 1933, 23, No. 150.

[13] I. C. Gardner, "The Effect of a Group of Social Stimuli Upon Attitudes," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXVI (1935), 471-479.

direction intended by the speaker.

Speech Content. There have been a number of investigations concerned with the relative effectiveness of various kinds of speech content. The fundamental method has been the direct comparison of two or more types of speech material: emotional versus factual argument, extended versus condensed appeals, humorous versus nonhumorous treatment, provocative versus logical material, exhibitory versus academic style. Knower[14] used a comprehensive scheme for dividing and subdividing his subject groups, permitting analysis of the effects of a number of variables. Logical-factual and emotional arguments were found to be equally effective. Menefee and Granneberg,[15] on the other hand, found emotional appeals more effective than logical argument, and Lomas[16] found provocative presentation (emotional language and oratorical delivery) more effective than objective style (temperate language and conversational delivery).

Methods of Communication. Experimental comparisons of different modes of communication have been made. Wilke[17] and Knower[18] found platform speech more effective than the printed page. Cherrington and Miller[19] found a lecture on war by Kirby Page and a pamphlet on the same subject by Sherwood Eddy and Kirby Page about equal in persuasive effect.

Style of Presentation. Methods of presentation have been deemed worthy of investigation, particularly among experimenters interested in radio. One of the most comprehensive studies of this type was carried out by Willis.[20] In this investigation the forms compared were the straight talk, dramatization, and combined talk and dramatization. Likert type scales were constructed and used to measure the attitudes of audiences before and after presentation. Among high-school students dramatization produced a greater shift of attitude than straight talk or the combined form. The three forms seemed to be equally effective with audiences composed of college students.

Speech Delivery. One of the best known studies of speech delivery is the pioneer investigation by Woolbert[21] of vocal variety. A crude retention test was employed to determine the effects of different combinations of variation in rate, force, pitch, and quality. Although the data were not subjected to statistical analysis, some of the comparisons seemed to be significant, particularly the one between radical variations of all four factors and no variation of any. Radical variation produced relatively high audience retention. Another frequently mentioned study is the one carried out by Jersild[22] to determine the relative effectiveness of various modes of emphasis commonly employed by public speakers, such as gestures, loud voice, pauses, verbal emphasis, distributed and concentrated repetitions. The investigator found a wide range of difference in the ease with which statements emphasized by the various methods were remembered by audiences. Distributed repetitions seemed to be most effective. Another study of modes of emphasis was carried out more recently by Ehrensberger[23] us-

[14] Knower, *op. cit.*

[15] S. C. Menefee and A. G. Granneberg, "Propaganda and Opinions on Foreign Policy," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XI (1940), 393-404.

[16] Lomas, *op. cit.*

[17] Wilke, *op. cit.*

[18] Franklin Knower, "Experimental Studies of Changes in Attitude," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XXX (1936), 522-532.

[19] B. M. Cherrington and L. W. Miller, "Changes in Attitudes as the Result of a Lecture and of Reading Similar Materials," *Journal of Social Psychology*, IV (1933), 479-484.

[20] E. E. Willis, "The Relative Effectiveness of Three Forms of Radio Presentation in Influencing Attitudes," *Speech Monographs*, VII (1940), 41-47.

[21] Charles Woolbert, "The Effects of Various Modes of Public Reading," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, IV (1920), 162-185.

[22] A. T. Jersild, "Modes of Emphasis in Public Speaking," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, XII (1928), 611-620.

[23] Ehrensberger, *op. cit.*

ing improved techniques of investigation. The experimental groups were matched for intelligence, a number of speakers presented the stimulus material, a multiple-choice retention test was used, and the data were subjected to statistical analysis. Some of Jersild's conclusions were confirmed, and the results gave a striking demonstration of the effect of emphasis upon the ability of an audience to remember a spoken statement. Proactive verbal emphasis was particularly effective. The value of repetition as a mode of emphasis was demonstrated in the Jersild and Ehrensberger studies, as well as in some investigations by Cantril and Allport.[24]

Speech rate has received some attention from investigators. Brigance[25] made a descriptive study showing wide individual differences in rate of speech among twenty college orators. Ewbank[26] has done some preliminary investigations of speech rate, using a recall test in comparing the effectiveness of slow, medium, and fast rates of radio speaking. Cantril and Allport[27] also used retention as the criterion in studying the effect of rate in radio speaking.

Moore[28] employed an informal test of retention in comparing reading from notes and speech without notes, finding the latter to be more effective. The advantage of speaking without notes seemed to disappear, however, before a highly motivated audience.

Order. Jersild found that statements made early in a speech were better remembered by the audience than statements made late in the speech. Ehrensberger found just the reverse to be true. Sponberg[29] performed an experiment in which the supporting arguments of a speech were presented in different order before matched audiences. He found that the longest and most important argument was more effective when presented first than when presented last, with respect to the audience's ability to remember subject matter detail, and also with respect to the argument's influence over the opinions of the audience on the subject under discussion (war marriages).

Rhetoric. Although most of the studies of rhetoric have followed the critical and historical method, a few have been based upon an analysis of countable units. MacVaugh[30] counted lines in determining the amount of space emphasis given to ideational units in speeches by Harry Emerson Fosdick. He found that whereas a representative group of orators employed climax order in the organization of their speeches (most important idea last), Fosdick gave greatest space emphasis to the ideas appearing early in his sermons. Borchers[31] made a comparison of the written and oral styles of ten eminent men. Runion[32] analyzed sentence length, types of sentences, and figures of speech in addresses by Woodrow Wilson. A number of standard statistical indexes and procedures were employed in this investigation: means, standard deviation of distributions, probable error of means, reliability of mean differences, and critical ratios.

Drama. There have been a few studies of the reactions of theatre audiences to plays. Peterson and Thurstone[33] inves-

[24] H. Cantril and G. W. Allport, *The Psychology of Radio* (1935).

[25] W. Norwood Brigance, "How Fast Do We Talk," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XII (1926), 337-342.

[26] Henry Ewbank, "Studies in the Technique of Radio," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XVIII (1932), 560-571.

[27] Cantril and Allport, *op. cit.*

[28] H. T. Moore, "The Attention Value of Lecturing Without Notes," *Journal of Educational Value*, X (1919).

[29] Harold Sponberg, An Experimental Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Climax and Anti-Climax Order, M.A. thesis, University of Minnesota, 1942.

[30] G. S. MacVaugh, "Structural Analysis of the Sermons of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XVIII (1932), 531-546.

[31] Gladys Borchers, "An Approach to the Problem of Oral Style," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXII (1936), 114-117.

[32] Howard Runion, "An Objective Study of the Style of Woodrow Wilson," *Speech Monographs*, III (1936), 75-94.

[33] R. C. Peterson and L. L. Thurstone, *The Effect of Motion Pictures on the Social Attitudes of High School Children* (1933).

tigated the influence of motion pictures on the attitudes of children. Dolman[34] kept a prompter's record of audience laughter during five successive performances of a play. Lange[35,36] carried out a series of studies of audience laughter in theatre situations, and analyzed the consistency of laughter, and the effects of performance variables such as stage business and costume.

It has been demonstrated repeatedly in aforementioned studies, as well as others, that public address influences significantly the attitudes and opinions of audiences. There is evidence that this effect is usually of the nature of a modification of degrees of favorableness and unfavorableness of attitude, rather than a winning of total converts. This was indicated in the reactions of college students to Bryan's speech on evolution,[37] and also in the responses of an audience to a lecture on the League of Nations, reported by Remmers.[38] In the latter study a correlation of .66 was found between initial and final attitude scores, showing a rather pronounced tendency for an individual auditor to maintain the same relative position, although the score of the total group changed significantly.

Audience attitudes have been measured in some studies immediately after exposure to propaganda material, and again after an interval of weeks or months. The results of such investigations indicate that the persuasive effects of speeches, as well as motion pictures and pamphlets, are rather temporary, and that the subjects tend to regress toward their original attitudes. This was shown in a study by Chen,[39] who followed an experiment on the influence of oral propaganda with a retest five and one-half months later, and found that the effects of the speeches employed in the original study had nearly disappeared. Lull[40] found that some regression had occurred after three weeks.

Not only has the regression of attitudes been studied, but also the rate at which audiences forget material learned from expository speeches. A rapid loss of remembered detail, followed by a decelerating rate of forgetting was found by Jones to be typical among college students.[41] About 25 per cent was retained by the auditors after an interval of eight weeks, presumably as a more or less permanent acquisition.

General Conclusions

The foregoing serves to give a fairly adequate picture of the kinds of measurement employed and the types of study undertaken in these areas of investigation. Although the total accumulation of published research is not impressively large, a beginning has been made, and somewhat vaguely the outlines of a comprehensive program have begun to emerge. For the most part the studies have been concerned with the variable effects of styles of delivery, modes of presentation, and types of speech content. Relatively little has been done with the reactions of different types of audiences, *i.e.*, groups of auditors differentiated on the basis of sex, age, intelligence, prejudgment of the speaker or his subject. In the main the emphasis has been on the study of the immediate effect of

[34] John Dolman, "A Laugh Analysis of *The School for Scandal*," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XVI (1930), 432-445.

[35] F. E. Lange, A Statistical Study of Crowd Laughter, M.A. thesis, Columbia University, 1923.

[36] G. Murphy, L. B. Murphy, and T. M. Newcomb, *Experimental Social Psychology* (1937), pp. 688-689.

[37] Willey and Rice, *op. cit.*

[38] H. H. Remmers, "Measuring the Effect of a Lecture on Attitudes Toward the League of Nations," *Bulletin of Purdue University*, 37, *Studies in Higher Education*, XXXI (1936), 105-108.

[39] W. K. C. Chen, "Retention of the Effect of Oral Propaganda," *Journal of Social Psychology*, VII (1936), 479-483.

[40] P. E. Lull, "The Effectiveness of Humor in Persuasive Speech," *Speech Monographs*, VII (1940), 26-40.

[41] H. E. Jones, "Experimental Studies of College Teaching," *Archives of Psychology*, No. 68, 1923.

speech on the audience, with less concentration on the retention of attitudes and the rate of forgetting. In view of the obvious importance of the latter, and because there is no a priori reason for assuming that the immediate and long term effects of a speech are correlated, it seems entirely probable that regression will receive more attention in future experimentation.

Considerable advancement in research methodology can be discovered in the brief history of these programs. There is a distinct trend toward the employment of statistical procedures, and improved experimental controls appear in the use of samplings of speakers (rather than single speakers), in the matching of groups of auditors, and in the rotating of speakers and audiences to equate the influence of unknown spurious factors. Some critical writing and evaluative studies have appeared addressed directly and specifically to problems of research methodology, although as yet there has been little to insure maximum progress.

It would be difficult to appraise the effect of these programs of research upon the classroom teaching of public speaking. Some recent textbooks seem to ignore them entirely, others obviously reflect the outcomes of experimental investigations, still others quote studies directly. One possible effect, and no doubt a wholesome one, would be the classification of our concept of "good speech." Experimental studies employ one or more definite criteria for measuring or recording the influence of a speech, and the evaluation of the performance is based directly and solely upon the outcomes. Interestingly enough, when different types of criteria are employed in the same study, the results are not always positively correlated. For example, Sponberg[42] found significant differentiation between climax and anticlimax order on the basis of retention and change of opinion, but no differentiation whatever on the basis of ratings for "convincingness." Willis[43] found that dramatization had the greatest effect upon the attitudes of high-school students, but that combined drama and straight talk was preferred by them. Outcomes of this type could be cited from a number of other studies, and it becomes increasingly clear that the speech style which is consciously preferred by the audience is not always the one that induces the most vivid and accurate memory of subject matter detail, nor is it necessarily the one which has the greatest influence over beliefs and attitudes. In a recent review of the literature on speech and personality Sanford[44] writes, "One suspects that good speaking and effective communications are different phenomena." The trends of evidence seem to support his idea, and suggest the need for redefinition of the term "good speaking."

The research of this field conveys the further implication that classroom instruction in speech will become to an increasing extent a technological study of speaker and audience reactions, with decreasing interest in the purely aesthetic qualities of speech, cultivated as an element of personal charm. Such a development might have a wholesome effect in relation to the problem of self-consciousness among students, and it would certainly increase the contribution of the field of speech to the study of education and propaganda in general.

[42] Sponberg, *op. cit.*
[43] Willis, *op. cit.*
[44] Fillmore H. Sanford, "Speech and Personality," *Psychological Bulletin*, 39 (1942), 811-845, p. 833.

FACTORS OF INFLUENCE IN RADIO SPEECH

HOWARD W. TOWNSEND
University of Texas

ON NOVEMBER 2, 1920, KDKA of Westinghouse Electric Company of East Pittsburgh, opened as a broadcasting station, and its first program presented the returns of the Harding election. By 1940 there were about 715 broadcasting stations and 33,000,000 receiving sets in the United States. Eighty-five per cent of the American families owned at least one radio, and it was turned on for 4.2 hours on the average day. In 1938 it was estimated that radio listening amounted to six and one-half times the person-listening hours spent at the movies. "Even allowing for interruptions caused by phone calls during favorite programs that's a 'lotta' listening. And fifty per cent of the time the listeners were hearing the spoken word."[1] Obviously this amount has increased during the war because of increased interest in news, and because of forced attention to the radio as a means of relaxation and entertainment.

This widespread use of radio suggests its unlimited possibilities for influencing public opinion. But the question is how effectively this is done. To what do listeners listen? Are they actually influenced by what they hear on the radio? (The Orson Welles *Invasion from Mars* program of several years past should answer this once and for all, it seems.) Are people more influenced by radio than by the printed page, the movies, or the face-to-face situation? What is the best policy for the speaker to follow when using the radio, whether he is trying to sell himself, his product, his ideas, or his way of life?

We hardly need experimental studies to demonstrate that radio communication *can* bring results. Look first at the corporations that have found radio profitable. The Chase and Sanborn Coffee, Texaco Oil, or Johnson's Wax, as examples, do not spend from $5,000 to $25,000 for a radio broadcast over a national hook-up because of a generous desire to entertain the public. They have a product to sell, and they want to persuade listeners to buy.

Radio is a powerful medium for persuading the public to purchase. Could it not be just as powerful in disseminating ideas of good government, of developing patriotic spirit, of educating the masses? We believe it is doing that, and some day we will have facts to prove our assumption. Some day we will know exactly, or nearly so, what influence the radio is having on stimulating bond purchases in this war.

II

But the appeal of the commercial advertiser over the radio takes a different form from that of traditional public speaking. It takes the form of entertainment, with speechmaking and announcements minimized. More and more, announcements are being included within the program proper and are not presented as a separate part. The "speaker" for Johnson's Wax is always a guest in the McGee home; Gracie Allen gets herself tied in knots with Swan Soap; Bob Hope makes use of Pepsodent in his lines; and so with the majority of the stars. Is it significant that the straight speaking part is minimized to the extent of being omitted altogether?

The minister, the politician, the news commentator, the lecturer still remain

[1] H. L. Ewbank, "Trends in Research in Radio Speech," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXVI (1940), 282-283.

as an important part of the radio field as a whole, but what can they do to compete with the high-priced entertainer? How can they secure an audience? What is most effective for them in trying to persuade?

"There have been many studies made to determine when different groups listen in and when they prefer to listen. The evening hours are generally best, the audience peak being between seven and ten P.M. Women listen more during the morning hours, children after school, and farmers from twelve noon to two P.M.; Sunday and Friday evenings are preferred; on Saturday evenings the sets are less used."[2] It must be obvious how valuable this information is to the manufacturer who wants to sell beauty soap to women, or Ovaltine to children; to the Congressman who wants to address the farmers within his district. Link, after his study, presented another aspect of the picture: "We must admit that none of the present methods of measuring the radio audiences give us an adequate measure of the psychological aspects of the programs on listeners. They do not tell us how much of a program is listened to, how strong the impressions it makes. . . . They give us only a rough measure of whether or not people are listening at all. . . . But even such rough measures tell us something worth knowing, that is, whether or not people have come to the lecture at all. They are comparable to the attendance record in the classroom, which as educators know is a very rough measure indeed, but still very important."[3]

We know as a result of experimental studies and surveys and measurements that a great many people listen, and we know something about when and to what they listen. Other studies tell of the relative persuasive effect of different forms of broadcasting, but the difficulty here (as I see it) lies in the fact that *most of the results are based on study with experimental and control groups, not with the general public.* The effect of a radio address on a member of an experimental group may be splendid, but what proof has one that the individual in real life situations will ever listen to a radio address? Sitting in a classroom with an experimental group is one thing, and sitting at home in front of the radio with the power to turn the dial at will is another.

III

In general, the results of studies made by such men as Walter H. Wilke and Edgar F. Willis tend to show that there is not a great difference in the effectiveness between radio presentation and the printed page, provided the one is *good* radio and the other *good* printed material. Cantril and Allport, F. H. Lumley, H. V. Gaskill, R. M. Phillips, and others working on the relative effectiveness of the radio and the face-to-face situation, did not discover a great difference. However, the radio had the edge in most instances, I believe. The studies of each of these men involved so many details in varying situations that it is unfair to generalize about their findings as I have tried to do here. The moral, if I may be allowed that term, is that radio material, straight, drama, or otherwise, must be especially prepared and presented in order to be effective, and the age-old rules for good platform speaking will not always hold here.

Through long experience the rules of oratory have been more or less exactly formulated. The principles of effective radio speech have been less exactly stated. There are differences, however, which make it difficult to speak to an audience and into the microphone at the same time. Effective leadership

[2] F. H. Lumley, *Measurements in Radio* (Columbus, Ohio, 1934), p. 194.
[3] C. S. Link, *Educational Broadcasting 1936* (Chicago, 1937), pp. 275-279.

by means of radio speech is art. It is possible to make a few generalizations about radio speaking, but these do not encompass the essentials of the guest speaker. In addressing large publics it is desirable that the speaker should avoid local or sectional inflections and vocabulary. These distract and alienate a part of the listening public. Clarity is essential. Radio talks seem to require more concrete illustrations and more repetition, apparently because the listener's mind is not acting as creatively as in the face-to-face situation. In radio speech simplicity is at a premium. Of President Roosevelt it is said, "He speaks right out with no 'high-falutin' words." There is not much chance of Americans failing to get the meaning in such expressions as "killing two birds with one stone"; "I have no expectation of making a hit every time I come to bat"; "the kind of prosperity that will lead us back into another tail spin." Brevity is requisite. Radio listeners are more readily tired than is an audience that can occupy itself with personal characteristics of a speaker. In oratory, the finer shadings of emotional expression are in part presented by facial expression and gesture. The radio speaker must cultivate a greater variety of tone and inflection to communicate these. Emotional appeals can be made in radio speaking, but the technique differs from that of the orator. In the early days of the radio, commentators declared that the demagogue was outmoded. Since then we have had many radio demagogues. The traditional tricks of platform demagoguery were largely outmoded, but new types of demagogues, implemented with new varieties of emotional appeal, have appeared. However, in general, radio speaking has been characterized by more frequent appeals to logical thinking than has popular oratory. Political controversy over the radio has appeared to have more rational tone than have the oratorical efforts of spellbinders swinging around the circle. During the 1936 campaign, Father Coughlin, an exception to this rule, had large audiences of listeners but apparently had very little effect in changing the voting habit.[4]

Mistiming is one of the sins of radio, and only the President of the United States is allowed to run over-time on the air. There is reason to believe the claim that Herbert Hoover lost thousands of votes one evening in 1932 when he ran past schedule and talked right through Ed Wynn's program. Every mother who had to send her child to bed crying that night questioned the advisability of re-electing Mr. Hoover for President. The listener always tends to lose interest in long talks. The optimum length of time for ordinary educational, political, factual, or news broadcasts is probably from ten to twenty minutes. Even so popular and persuasive a radio speaker as President Roosevelt, chooses, probably wisely so, to confine his fireside chats on political topics to approximately twenty minutes.

[4] W. Albig, *Public Opinion* (1939), p. 350.

IV

Imagine a speaker preparing to present an address over the radio that he has been giving to audiences face-to-face. Instead of speaking to a large audience, he would instead talk as though to two or three people in a living room. "The most frequent error which beginners in radio commit," writes Mr. A. L. Barnard of National Broadcasting Company (in a personal letter), "is that they try to deliver an oration or 'pound' the message across, in the style of an old-fashioned and rather loud-mouthed politician." They "act as though they were addressing an audience of millions of people. It is true that those same millions may be listening in but they are not all in one group. The speaker is really addressing millions of groups, each one being comprised of perhaps only two or three people. Therefore, he should cultivate the feeling that he is speaking only to that small-sized group of two or three persons."

Partly for this reason and partly because he is invisible, such a radio speaker would plan to speak more rapidly than before an audience face-to-face. Listeners cannot see him. They have only his

voice; and pauses, if they are too long, give the effect that the speaker has gone off the air. This does not mean that the speaker will talk so fast that he loses clearness of articulation, informing inflections, or what may be called the personality of voice. He simply talks as to a few people instead of to many. He would arouse the listener's sense of participation just as Huey Long used to do when he would, at the beginning of his talk, ask each listener to go to the telephone and call five persons to tell them to listen in, or as Franklin Roosevelt does when he says, "My friends."[5]

Only through applying principles which have proved effective can we hope to develop radio speech that will be effective in influencing public opinion. Yet our nation needs the influence of the radio more now than ever before. "The success of political democracy depends largely upon the interest and intelligence of the electorate and upon contact between the voters and their chosen executives. Commentators agree that there has been an increased interest in politics and public affairs with the development of the radio. Many people who would not go to a political meeting, for example, will tune in on political talks. It is probable that a part of the recent increase in voting in national elections may be ascribed to interest aroused by radio talks and to broadcasting of nominating conventions. In the national elections of 1856, 1860, and 1864 the percentage of the eligible votes that were cast were, respectively, 83.51, 84.19, and 84.85. The figures remained at about 80% until 1900. In 1904, 68.0% of those eligible voted; in 1912, 61.95%; in 1920, 52.36%. This was the low point. In 1928, 63.86% voted; in 1932, 65.13%; in 1936, almost 70% of the eligible voters appeared at the polls."[6] In 1940 all records were broken. Naturally, the emotion-arousing nature of the last three campaign issues was primarily responsible for the interest, but radio discussions were an important stimulant.

[5] H. Cantril and G. W. Allport, *The Psychology of Radio* (1935), pp. 122-124.

V

The job of discovering the final answer to these questions, if that be possible, has hardly been touched here, and it offers a challenge for research. May the war spur that on, and produce more effective use of radio for the good of all people. We need to replace blatant commercial propaganda with propaganda of deeper value to the citizen and to the nation, educational propaganda, patriotic propaganda, better means of living propaganda, and we must learn how to present it in such a manner that the public will want it as a steady diet, in addition to, if not in place of, light entertainment.

The speech of Martin J. Kennedy of New York in the United States House of Representatives in September, 1943, recommending freedom of speech by radio as the Twenty-second Amendment to the Constitution indicates that we are on the way forward. Said Representative Kennedy in conclusion: "America can only live while speech is free, and the most important of all speech is speech by radio."

[6] W. Albig, *Public Opinion* (1939), p. 355.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF MODERN SEMANTICS

WILLIAM G. HARDY
New York State College for Teachers

IN THE past several issues of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH considerable space has been devoted to analyses of semantic theory and to judgments on the place of semantics in the thinking of a speech teacher. Set as they are in a kaleidoscopic background of metaphysics and epistemology, logic and linguistics, psychology and sociology, rhetoric and poetic, semantic discussions are only too apt to prove that in the theoretical consideration of the mind's meanings every man's logic is his own. We are met with a confusing array of *ad hoc* principles, with a difficult jargon, and with an exposure of the commonplace and the obscure the like of which customarily attends our efforts to understand the nature of reality. We frequently become lost, in the name of criticism, in a hugger-mugger of apostolic zeal and special pleading. Accordingly, there may be some small virtue in an attempt—albeit abrupt and incomplete—to generalize the philosophies and aims of a few modern semantic theories, and to take stock of their purpose and promise for the future.

II

Who is the semanticist, and what are his works? In a broad sense the field may be circumscribed as the study of man's methods of interpreting experience; its subject-matter is the relation that obtains among experience, thought, and language. Grounded upon the belief that man's ability to symbolize (that is, to interpret and manipulate signs—*signs* being used here to stand for all mediating objects, including the visible and audible codes) is his most distinctly human attribute, semantics may be characterized as the investigation of the use of signs. In terms of a practical objective, the semanticist is interested in untangling the web of words that has been spun about the analysis of human intelligence; he is interested in simplifying and systematizing our understanding of man's interpretative activities.

Obviously this interest is not new. Yet, although sign analysis has been carried on more or less constantly since the days of the first Sophist, it is safe to say that never before have so many people in so many different fields of knowledge been concerned with the study of man's symbolic habits. Charles W. Morris has pointed out that the predilection for concentrating on the symbolic functions of man is "one of the most characteristic accompaniments of the various manifestations of empiricism."[1] This observation accounts well enough for the current torrent of speculation on meaning. The modern mind is characterizable by its presumption that all knowledge arises in and must be confirmed by experience. The apprehension and organization of experience into clearly articulated beliefs, of whatever sort or extent, is, in the main, an interpretative process; from which it follows that the world of existence is a world of meanings. We have become conscious of divergent social forces and of varying perspectives. The result is a strong conviction that truth-values are not absolutes but functions of meanings, relative to the thing known, the habits of the knower, and the medium which connects them. This medium is usually language, and we are habitually critical of

[1] C. W. Morris, *Logical Positivism, Pragmatism and Scientific Empiricism* in *Exposés de Philosophie Scientifique* (Paris, 1937), p. 56.

the fact that the awareness of environment which we call intelligence is dependent upon our symbolic habits; theory of knowledge has become theory of communication.[2] Whether one chooses to orient his existence from a faith based upon aesthetics, science, religion, or practical efficiency, according to systemic dogma, systemless scepticism, or any stage intermediate, he acts in a realm of meanings. In sum, the generative idea of modern semantic theorizing is to be found in the metaphysics of empiricism: the empirical mind is inevitably led to consider communication by signs the *sine qua non* of both personal reflection and impersonal knowledge. In his study of the meaning-process—of the relations obtaining among experience, thought, and language—the modern theorist seeks a method for putting his world in order. Some theorists are content to work with methods of describing the use of signs in man's bio-social existence; they believe that an accurate understanding of sign usage is necessary for an intelligent apprehension of the material problems of reality. Others are palpably normative in their thinking; they believe that most of the world's ills are caused by inappropriate symbolic behavior and that semantic re-education is a fundamental need in the world today.

III

I. A. Richards belongs in this second group of normative semanticists. His work with C. K. Ogden on *The Meaning of Meaning* comes early in the modern construction of a science of symbolism. Though neither of these men has, so far as I am aware, made an outright commitment to a traditional school of philosophy—a negative fact that has aroused suspicion among some critics[3]—many of their ideas can be associated with the tradition of empiricism in England. In general, they adopt the current nominalistic attitude against the magic of words, and it is obvious that they find their intellectual genealogy in the linguistic theories of Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, and Bentham. Their treatment of word-ways in *The Meaning of Meaning* is designed to furnish a means to improve communication and, through this, civilization. Richards is considerably exercised over "our daily losses in communication"; we must be made symbol-wise through a program of general semantic education; we must learn how words work in order that progress may be realized and quickened.

The basic idea in *The Meaning of Meaning*—the foundation of Richards's science of symbolism as the organon of education—is the radical positivist dichotomy set up between the two uses of language, one the symbolic, the meaningful, the other the emotive, by inference the meaningless. Thomas Clark Pollock in his recent book, *The Nature of Literature*, has made a careful analysis of the *ad hoc* definitions employed here by Ogden and Richards, and there is no need to repeat the criticism. In essence the critical conclusion is this: by their definitions and constructions Ogden and Richards rule that only public, scientific reference is cognitive and meaningful; private reference, including literature, is conative and simply expressive of emotional states. Resting as it does upon an inadequate theory of signs that is in turn based upon a too highly selective interpretation of an early version of the conditioned response, this distinction between symbolic and emotive discourse seems untenable. Numerous critics—psychologists, philosophers and litterateurs—have sub-

[2] Susanne K. Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key* (Cambridge, 1942), p. 265.

[3] John Crowe Ransom, for example, refers to Richards as "a thinker who may be defined, I imagine, as another case of the psychologist who proposes to pursue his thinking without a philosophy" in his review of Richards's *Interpretation in Teaching*, *Yale Review*, XXVIII (1939), 411.

stantiated this view. And it seems pertinent to remark that ever since the publication of *The Meaning of Meaning*, Richards, whose present interests lie in the field of literary analysis, has been trying to make room in his theory for poetry, the ugly duckling of positivist semantics that was ruled out of the family of meaningful discourse by this uncongenial and unempirical dichotomy.

In general terms, Ogden and Richards choose to emphasize the normative features of symbolism in such a way as to vitiate much of their science. Still devoted to the belief that the study of wordways is a vital means of solving world-problems, a faith that some empiricists find it impossible to share, Richards has more recently foregone much of the positivism of his early work and now concerns himself with the educative value of propositional analysis, literary interpretation, and the study of metaphor. Grammar and logic become for him the anatomization of syntax and reference—propositional analysis according to context; rhetoric he defines as the study of misinterpretation. He no longer stresses any dichotomy of linguistic usage, but works for word-consciousness on the principles of nominalism. These are by no means radical objectives, and represent a point of view that is only to be expected from one who came to reform the principles of linguistic but remained to study, translate and interpret poetic.

We may agree with Albert Guérard when he writes, in reviewing H. R. Walpole's recent popularization of Richards's scheme, that "in the old days philosophy and the classics provided a few select minds with all the semantic training they needed"; in these hurried modern times, he continues, these ideas of semantics "might prove acceptable as a tabloid version of the humanities." If I understand Richards aright, his point is that modern education on the public level needs not less humanism but more, keyed, however, to the tempo and temper of the twentieth century—that there is ample room for a modernized version of the trivium that is consistent with the contemporary, voluntaristic, empirical attitude toward reality. Although approving Richards's educational ideals, one need not agree with him that even their complete realization will remove as many problems as he seems to believe; as important as verbal confusions may be, their resolution will yet leave a residue of material difficulties which are evidently very much a part of the nature of reality.

IV

The most sweepingly positivist of current theories is Alfred Korzybski's system of General Semantics, the science of man. Korzybski's work is designed to serve as an educative corpus for reforming the symbolic functions of an inhuman humanity. He, too, is a normative analyst; his interpretation of time-binding furnishes an ethics that is a version of the idea of progress—aside from this Korzybski's ideas seem to have no moral content; his perspective includes a radical scientific acceptance of the universe; trained neither as philosopher nor scientist, he is public relations counsel for a universal technology. Korzybski does not claim novelty, and, in truth, there are few new ideas in his system. The fundamental tenet of the non-identification of words with things was succinctly stated by the Hellenic empirics and is extended in Book III of Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. There, too, in Chapter IV, is the semantic statement of basic undefined terms, and in Chapter X of the same book, on "The Abuses of Words," Locke anticipates most of Korzybski's polemics. That General Semantics is like and yet transcends other world-views of a technological utopia is

doubtless a feature of the times and of the author's persistent spirit.

There is much in *Science and Sanity* that is perennially useful. Those of us who teach rhetoric are only too familiar with the unintelligent adherence to word-magic, with the "elementalistic" restrictions of natural language, and with the tendency to believe upon insufficient evidence. The correction of these quite human shortcomings has been for ages past the primary goal of a liberal education. Moreover, Korzybski's insistence upon the activities of the human organism as a whole and his neurological description of consciousness are serviceable; they combat the tendency among epistemologists to proceed as though there were two worlds open for empirical construction. And it goes almost without saying that any therapeutic system as genuinely useful to psychiatry as General Semantics seems to be, answers a great need.

As a normative pattern, however, Korzybski's system rests upon a faith that one may or may not accept. His analysis of the ills of man and their treatment represents a scheme that is strikingly like the medieval *scala perfectionis*, the ladder of perfection. In place of the theology of a former age Korzybski substitutes the science of today. Somehow, we know not how, natural languages have plodded their delusioned way, ever static, diffusing a primitive logic of word-magic. Mathematics, the language of science, is seemingly unadditive and inexplicably different structurally from natural language; it burst upon the twentieth century like Athena from Zeus's brain, man's perfect creation. For Korzybski, as for Richards in his early writing, literature offers little of the meaningful to repay men's study of it. Neither poet nor philosopher has genuine insight to add to the world's wisdom. Korzybski condemns them, by a curiously two-valued logic, to a nebulous other-worldliness of intensional meaning. In essence the philosophy of General Semantics as it is presented in *Science and Sanity* is constructed upon a scientism and a mathematicism that is of course a common basis for belief in reality, but which remains only one among several possible perspectives.

If the critic does not share Korzybski's fundamental faith, he agrees neither with the general semanticist's diagnosis that "the correction of the disordered functioning of our symbolic process is a root problem in human affairs,"[4] nor that the proposed treatment will prove efficacious. Accordingly, the general semanticist's attitude toward the utility of his system and his self-dedication to the construction of a technological utopia are understandable, but exceed the limits of credibility. From his mathematicized view of language and of the nature of existence, Korzybski evidently envisions a scientific humanism that some of us may think is only quasi-empirical. This, I believe, is the burden of Jeanette Anderson's recent criticisms of Korzybski's work. In simple truth, everybody—every responsible "thinker," every "sane" man—is not a positivist, and one must be a radical positivist to accept the tenets laid down in *Science and Sanity*. Eager to rehabilitate mankind on the basis of physical theory, Korzybski seems to forget that the study of man is greater in scope than any one of man's particular perspectives.

Education on Korzybski's principles becomes almost ahumanistic. On the assumption of his ideals, natural language and its functions are not only animalistic mistakes but unnecessary vestiges of primitive cultures. Thus we must be educated in the nonuse of language. In a way, this is Platonic mysticism. Such

[4] S. I. Hayakawa in a review of *Science and Sanity*, *American Speech*, XVIII (1943), 226.

training would, theoretically at least, ultimately do away with normal *displaced speech*—our ability to react to a word as though the objects it designates were present and bio-socially effective—and reduce language to an analytical condition in which what we now recognize as speech would be impossible; we should be left with ideal, denotative forms, a mathematicized "language" believed by Korzybski to be the *summum bonum*.

The corollary of this hyper-extensionalism is that in this technological utopia there is no distinguishable realm of political and ethical choice; therefore any training in ethics is unnecessary. This is an inevitable implication of mathematicism, for, as Campbell once pointed out, mathematics admits no degrees of evidence. The system of General Semantics, theoretically organized in terms of multi-dimensional orientations and inconclusive conclusions, does away with value-judgments which by definition are "false-to-facts"—vestigial remnants of primitive languages. Such an abolition of the language of values is imaginable, no doubt, as a postulate of a utopian world; as an educative predicate of the real world, however, Korzybski's ideal is something less than descriptive of man's behavior, actual or potential.

V

In Charles W. Morris's theory of sign analysis, or semiotic, these positivist extremes are brought into focus by combination with the philosophy of pragmatism. Here Korzybski's science of man becomes the science of man's symbolic habits; whereas the general semanticist is apt to limit his attention to the empirical relation between words and things, and so tell only part of the story, Morris recognizes the word-thing relationship as only one of three integral elements of the process of meaning. Morris has a dual purpose in putting forward his ideas: He and his colleagues in the current encyclopedic movement for the unification of science want to produce a consistent method of describing meanings empirically; and he wants to develop a critical metalanguage capable of expressing the theoretical aspects of diverse systems of knowledge. Rooted in the analytic struggles of Hellenic philosophy, of medieval conceptualism, of Lockeian logic, and of C. S. Peirce's theory of signs, semiotic can be interpreted as an attempt to establish a systematic universe of discourse for the study of meanings.

In commenting on various recent theories of meaning, Morris remarks:

> Too much mystery is thrown around the analysis or clarification of meaning: the meaning of a term is completely specified when it is known what objects the term designates, what expectations it produces in the persons for whom it has meaning, and what its connections are with other terms in the language of which it is a part.[5]

This statement expresses the essence of semiotic, and suggests the nature of the approach to the complex relationships holding between man's experience and his symbolic functions. Morris's theory presents an organic synthesis of empiricism, pragmatism and formalism. He writes:

> Analysis reveals that linguistic signs sustain three types of relations . . . which define the three dimensions of meaning. These dimensions in turn are objects of investigation by syntactics, semantics, and pragmatics, semiotic being the general science which includes all of these and their interrelations.[6]

The study of sign relations within each of the three subordinate fields represents an abstraction from the actual sign situation. Thus, the logician may con-

[5] C. W. Morris, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

centrate on the implicative relations among signs, an approach undertaken by Russell, Wittgenstein, Carnap, Tarski and many others; the semanticist may analyze referential relations, but not in the radical positivist style, undertake thereby to develop an independent system of language that neglects to consider the integral logical and pragmatic elements of language; the pragmatist, Karl Mannheim, for example, may concern himself with the purposive, intensional character of meanings.

If Morris were to contribute nothing else to the modern study of meaning, this clear delineation of the systemic interrelations of sign usage marks him as a theorist worth attending to. Much current speculation rules out of existence the purposive quality of language, overlooks the intersubjectivity of language, underrates the distinctly social aspects of our verbal behavior, and proceeds with insufficient emphasis on the importance of social psychology in the study of linguistics. The pragmatic view corrects this state of affairs.

Aimed at the consistent exposition of men's interpretative activities, semiotic delineates a practical means of eliminating confusions from critical discussion. It is not an answer to the world's ills, but a method—founded upon behavioristic descriptions—to promote the understanding of them. As a science it is not new nor mature, but a synoptic idea dedicated to empirical methodology. So far as systematic knowledge is concerned, semiotic is eclectic. It encompasses mathematics, symbolic logic, and linguistics; it utilizes the methods and the findings of social psychology, rhetoric, the sociology of knowledge and psychoanalysis. Devoted to the task of organizing the rules of sign usage, semiotic is, in Morris's opinion, "the framework in which to fit the modern equivalent of the ancient trivium of logic, grammar, and rhetoric."[7] In Morris's terms science is not a body of knowledge but a methodology. Assuming that philosophy proceeds by the same methods as science, he argues that philosophy cannot obtain "an order of certainty different from that of science." Therefore, he envisions a unity between the philosophy of science and the science of philosophy, the fundamental feature of which is that all knowledge is an interpretative study of meanings to be treated as a communicative process. On these grounds a theory of signs is the *sine qua non*. How far Morris's view tends to circumscribe the field of philosophy is a question on which empirical philosophers themselves differ. But so long as the empirical attitude remains in the ascendancy we may be certain that the theory of signs will continue to be central in speculative circles and will continue to undergo further refinements for its serviceability to an ever-increasing diversity of knowledge.

VI

Perhaps one of the most notable features of modern thought is the development of an encompassing concept of *the social*, a concept which steadily forces upon us awareness of perspectives and concern for their meanings. This awareness is the controlling element of Karl Mannheim's theory of the sociology of knowledge. The main idea of Mannheim's major work—published in English in 1936 under the title of *Ideology and Utopia*—is that thought, particularly thought functioning in political action and ethical choice, can be adequately understood only in terms of the habits of the group to which the individual belongs. Mannheim undertakes to describe perspectives in social terms; he is interested in developing an empirical

[7] C. W. Morris, *Foundations of the Theory of Signs* in *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science* (Chicago, 1938), I, ii, 56.

science capable of classifying the social genesis of thought-patterns or meanings. Mannheim is very much a pragmatist. He believes in no such transcendental entity as a group mind, yet it is a fact that the individual speaks the language of his group, and so must think as the group thinks. Nor is there any such phenomenon as original, individual thought unconditioned by society. For the most part, Mannheim believes, political activity is carried on by "men in groups who have developed a particular style of thought in an endless series of responses to certain typical situations characterizing their common position."[8] This is familiar ground for the student of rhetoric. Mannheim's system of classifying the social genesis of thought is an analysis of what Morris calls the pragmatical dimension of sign analysis, and there is ample reason to believe that the consistent application of Mannheim's formula will eventually result in useful knowledge about the social conditioning of perspectives.

VII

Thomas Clark Pollock's psycho-linguistic theory of literature is one of the few modern studies of meaning that is specifically related to nonscientific discourse. It supplies a clear refutation of an overt concentration on extensional thought and of the positivist dichotomy wherein scientific language is meaningful and literary expression is meaningless. Pollock's principal point is that there is a literary use of language that is in every degree the counterpart of a scientific use of language. He distinguishes these two general purposes of signs according to the nature of the activity that each performs: science employs a language (referential symbolism) that abstracts from the continuum of experience; literature employs a language (evocative symbolism) that calls up or controls experience. Each represents one phase of the dual means whereby man relates language to experience. Neither is superior nor inferior to the other: the behaving Man is the user in both instances, and no man lives a day without using both. Pollock regrets—and many of us would concur—that in this age of science, literature and its devotees are too often on the defensive. The fault here, if there be a fault, must be shared. On the one hand, the modern humanist does not always include a scientific attitude among his values; on the other hand, there are many people today who are unaware of the nature of literature. There is need for a theory, Pollock believes, that offers an accurate comparison between these two uses of language. Moreover, it is timely for the teacher in a period when education is coming more and more under the control of theory; whereas the construction of a sound literary theory may be no more than an intellectual pastime for those who have learned to read literature, "for those whose adolescence lies ahead, it may be a dominant factor in determining how and what they learn to read."[9] Pollock's ideas articulate what many feel strongly but have difficulty in stating in a fashion consonant with scientific values—the conviction that literature shares with science the more or less stable gleanings from man's attempt to understand existence that we call knowledge. Here is the knowledge not of abstracted experience but of re-created experience that is forever one of the most vital aspects of man's ability to use symbols. On these grounds every teacher of speech would do well to read *The Nature of Literature*. True, the book adds little to the traditional humanistic view of the relation between

[8] Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia*, trans. Louis Wirth and Edward Shils (1936), p. 3.

[9] T. C. Pollock, *The Nature of Literature* (Princeton, 1942), p. 163.

literature and experience; Pollock simply builds upon the thesis that poetic is the language of values that demonstrates life in concrete terms. But he gives this view a provocative setting and supplies a genuine distinction between scientific and literary discourse that is much needed in the current study of meanings.

VIII

There are many other semantic theories acquaintance with which may prove stimulating to the teacher of speech. G. W. Cunningham advances the proposition, implicit in the thinking of Morris and Mannheim, that "the acquisition of knowledge is penetration into the significance of reference."[10] This epistemological aspect of the study of meaning is what Susanne K. Langer calls "the new key of philosophy," and her latest book offers a provocative discussion of the relations between meaning and knowing, as well as an interesting and readable exposition of the relative services of "discursive" and "intensive" symbolism.[11] The student of meaning should be acquainted, too, with P. W. Bridgman's operational theory as it is set forth in *The Logic of Modern Physics*, and with Gustaf Stern's very lucid treatise on semasiology, *Meaning and Change of Meaning*.

IX

Several ideas—that meaning is a referential process; that it is equatable with knowing; that it can best be described in terms of the interaction among the component elements of reference; and that the knowing process is structurally similar to communicative activity—are derivable from modern semantic theory. Perhaps the most notable aspects of descriptive semantics are the reduction of the study of meanings to a simple formula of sign analysis, and the emphasis upon the variability of truth-values in the spirit of twentieth-century voluntarism. As for the educative value of semantic training, the normative theorists seem ill-advised in their belief that the study of word-ways will remove the material problems of reality; at most this modern study is a revised version of the trivium, serviceable only as an aid in removing the verbal confusions that inevitably enfold material issues. Obviously, one must take his choice as to the normative features of semantic theorizing. The usual caveat applies here: before one undertakes to redirect his teaching methods according to some particular theory of meaning, he had best examine closely the postulates upon which that theory is founded.

The objectives of modern semantics are not new, yet man's symbolic activities in contemplation and in action, in the acquisition of knowledge and in the communication of it, in the abstraction from experience that is science and in the re-creation of experience that is literature—his interpretative capacities in all the diverse pursuits of existence—offer material for study and understanding that must ever be reworked and reconstituted. Whatever may happen to the organization of the science of signs, the study of sign usage is an integral part of the understanding of existence.

[10] This theory is developed by Cunningham in "Meaning Reference and Significance," *Philosophical Review*, XLVII (1938), 155-175.

[11] Susanne K. Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key* (Cambridge, 1942).

TWO AND TWO MAKE ONE WHAT?

FORREST H. ROSE
Southeast Missouri State Teachers College

Characters of the dialogue: Abstruscio and Obtuscio

Abstruscio: Greetings, my friend Obtuscio. Your face bears a thoughtful expression this morning.

Obtuscio: It may, indeed. I have been reading a series of articles in the Q.J. concerning semantics and they have given me much to think over.

Abstruscio: I, too, read the articles and I agree that they provoke thought. And what do you make of them?

Obtuscio: I hardly know. There seem to be several grains of truth on both sides of the controversy.

Abstruscio: I agree again. Have you tried applying the scientific method?

Obtuscio: No. I have hardly felt up to it. Have you?

Abstruscio: Only in a limited way, limited primarily by my own inadequacies.

Obtuscio: And were you in any way successful?

Abstruscio: Of that you shall judge, if you have the time. Yesterday, while attending worship in the sanctuary, my thoughts kept wandering from the service to the articles in the Q.J., so I began studying the Lord's Prayer in light of the articles. Never before had I realized what a semantic monstrosity it is.

Obtuscio: Indeed? I am afraid I do not follow you.

Abstruscio: Take this line, for instance: Give us this day our daily bread. Quite obviously, the Master would not expect us to confine our diets to bread. Ergo, the line, to be scientific, should read: Give us this day our daily bread, meat, potatoes, string beans, leafy salad, etc.

Obtuscio: I begin to see your point. But since there are three meals during the usual day—I suppose I should not use the term "meals" since there are various meals: corn meal, oatmeal, cottonseed meal . . . .

Abstruscio: Exactly. You cannot use "meals" and be scientific. Webster gives no fewer than six entirely different meanings for the word "meal." Try "repast." Webster gives only one meaning for that word that isn't archaic or obsolete.

Obtuscio: Very well. Since there are three repasts during the usual day and since the food involved each time differs in most cases, would it not be more scientific to divide the repasts into the usual breakfast, lunch, and dinner?

Abstruscio: I see that you are apt. The line then would read: Give us this day our three repasts, as follows: Breakfast—Grapefruit, oatmeal, toast, and coffee; Lunch—Ham and lettuce sandwich, potato chips, and milk; Dinner—Meat, potatoes, string beans, salad, bread and butter, jelly, tea, etc.

Obtuscio: Correct. But would it not be necessary to specify, for instance, just what meat one wanted—keeping in mind the rationing procedures, of course—and how one wanted it prepared? Should not one specify that the potatoes are to be mashed, fried, or baked? Otherwise would there not be the possibility of unscientific reactions on the part of the referendary?

Abstruscio: I believe you are right. And then this thought strikes me: Suppose one were repeating the Prayer in the afternoon. He presumably has already had two repasts, in which case would

it not be rather absurd to ask for three?

Obtuscio: Agreed. Under that circumstance, perhaps it would be more scientific to substitute "tomorrow" for "this day" so that the line would read: Give us tomorrow our three repasts, etc.

Abstruscio: Exactly. And for good measure and to eliminate the possibility of future misunderstandings, let us include "and on each successive day" so that the line will read: Give us tomorrow and on each successive day our three repasts, etc.

Obtuscio: What provision should be made for varying the menu from day to day?

Abstruscio: I regret that I cannot go into that today; I have a meeting scheduled with my friend Semantes. But I make this observation before I leave: In all probability the reason some prayers are seemingly unanswered undoubtedly lies in the fact that they are so unscientifically stated that they are misunderstood.

MISS ANDERSON'S CRITIQUE OF GENERAL SEMANTICS

A. B. POMERANTZ
Lieutenant, United States Army

PERMIT me to enter a brief reply to Miss Anderson's rebuttal of my counterargument to her Critique of General Semantics.[1]

I suppose it would be best for me to admit that I'm poor at rhetoric. I must have presented my propositions very poorly, else how could Miss Anderson have misunderstood me (correction: understood me differently)? For instance, I should have said specifically that I do not consider science and rhetoric antithetical. I should have emphasized my belief that Miss Anderson's rejection of General Semantics is rhetorical rather than scientific in that she pleads a point of view, but has not reported experiments to prove the hypothesis invalid.

I should have more forcefully said that Miss Anderson's arguments are rhetorical and nonscientific since she insists so utterly on conformity with "established fact," agreement with current theory, and the impossibility of the observation, measurement, and prediction of human behavior by *a* or *the* scientific method. Arguments of this type are the very antithesis of scientific thinking. They are also very reminiscent (I do not say "derived from") of Aristotelian *topoi.*

Apparently I should never have admitted that I haven't done "extensive reading" in *Science and Sanity.* May I say that I have good reason to "intuit" that Korzybski does not anatomize Twitmyer and Nathanson's x-factor and West's residual diathesis? My point was that these concepts are hypothetical constructs used to explain rather delimited phenomena, and that Miss Anderson's free use of them fills them with more content than their promulgators intended. Now I add the point that such indiscriminate use of terms must be only for *effect,* for persuasion, and is not scientific.

It is a matter of small moment who made the original statement that speech is personality, and that he is now a Korzybski disciple. The point is that here is a statement of identity which Miss Anderson uses, with approval, and makes it one of her reasons for rejecting General Semantics. (Speech is personal-

[1] QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXIX (December, 1943), 468-473.

ity: General Semantics cannot analyze personality: ergo, it cannot analyze speech.) I submit that the copula in "Pomerantz is a lieutenant" has a different logical function than the copula in the statement that speech is personality. Miss Anderson's *reductio* of my argument is meaningless.

More than ever I see that I should have read *Science and Sanity*. Else how could I have ever supposed that the adoration of disciples does not change a hypothesis into a law? To reject a point of view because of those who believe it to extremes is hardly scientific. It is rhetorical.

Once again I regret my faulty rhetoric. Had it been properly applied, Miss Anderson would have seen, in spite of her hasty reading, that my main argument was that her reasons for rejecting General Semantics are scientifically reactionary, and now I say, politically immature. To cry "totalitarian" at a point of view which claims, among other things, that we'd be better off if we recognized that "freedom" means many things, sounds to me like a good bit of getting-on-the-bandwagon with those who've suddenly discovered democracy. To me scientific reaction and political immaturity are far more serious than whether or not General Semantics can be applied to the field of speech; one would be just as wrong in proposing to extend the application of General Semantics by finding it to be essentially democratic in spirit.

As Professor Knott predicted, this discussion has become rather extended. But perhaps it has served to clarify positions, and so diminish adventitious interlinear translations.

EUPHONY AND CACOPHONY OF ENGLISH WORDS AND SOUNDS*

EDWARD L. THORNDIKE

Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University

CERTAIN words and combinations of words and certain of the sounds of which words and parts of words are composed are supposed to be more pleasing than others. This supposition is correct. The correctness of customary views concerning which words and combinations of words and parts of words are more pleasing than others and why they are so is by no means certain. In particular the part played by the mere sound of the words has probably been exaggerated, and the importance, within the field of the sound of words, of vowels, liquids, and musical quality may have been exaggerated.

The orthodox views concerning the pleasant and unpleasant features of words as words will be recalled by the following quotation:

> It is probable that in particular the tone color of the vowels is significant, so that the fuller tone color of the open vowels is more pleasing to the ear than the poorer tone color of the closed vowels, that, for example, the open German *a* is preferable to the closed Danish *a* (I P A Æ). Moreover, the variety which a rich system of vowels offers makes a direct appeal. Among the consonants the voiced influence the ear more agreeably than the voiceless, which have only the effect of noise [Flagstad, Chr. B., *Psychologie der Sprachpädagogik*, p. 32].

With a view to finding out more about likings for words, I have made two rather extensive surveys in the case of college students and educated adults.

* Parts of this article appeared in 1939, in a Festschrift volume in honor of Professor Theophilus Boreas; published at Athens, Greece.

The first was of general likings, for words presented *visually alone, or visually and by sound*, the subjects of the experiment being instructed:

> You are to record your liking or dislike for each of these words as a word. You may consider how it looks, how it sounds, and any other features of it. You are to report your attitude toward the words, not the realities they stand for. Thus it is your feelings for the words, *money* and *Christmas* not for the real things, *money* and *Christmas*, that you are to record. Write LL if you are sure that you like the word. Write L if you think you like it, but are not sure. Write DD if you are sure that you dislike the word. Write D if you think you dislike it but are not sure. If you have no clear feeling toward the word, write nothing.

Sometimes numbers were used instead of the LL, L, D and DD.

The second set of experiments was similar except that the likes and dislikes were reported for the *sounds alone*.

I have records from 16 or more persons, and usually from 64 or more, for each of over two thousand words. As a measure, I shall use the difference, likes (sure and probable) minus dislikes (sure and probable) in a group of 16. This can vary from +16 to −16. The figure will commonly be an average from four or more groups and so represent rather precisely the general drift among educated adults. We will call the scores for words as words G scores, and those for sound alone S scores.

Feelings toward words are universal among the hundreds of persons studied. Not one was found in either survey who had no likes and dislikes, though every group was told that they were to report nothing but genuine feelings.

The great majority of educated adults are unable to distinguish their feelings toward the mere sound of a word from their feelings toward it as a word. It may even be doubted whether experts in phonetics or music can do so. Most teachers of literature cannot. The likes and dislikes reported for sound alone are almost exactly the same as those reported for the word as a word.[1]

The attitude toward the mere sound of a word is for most persons inseparable from the general attitude toward the word as a word. Either the likes and dislikes of the sounds determine almost entirely the likes and dislikes of the word as a whole, or the latter so suffuse and interpenetrate the former that a person who thinks he is reporting for sound alone is, in most cases, really expressing his general attitude.

The latter is what happens. The word as a word evokes certain tendencies. Regardless of how these may have been formed in the past, they are felt as belonging to the sound. They determine the response, for most persons, equally when the person thinks of the word in a general way and when he thinks of the sound alone. Further evidence for this is found in the likings for words which sound much alike but have very different past associations. Thus the sounds of *hoar, quaint* and *coral* are much liked, but the sounds of *whore, ain't*, and *quarrel* are extremely unpleasant.

A list of the words most liked and most disliked for sound alone is instructive. Such a list chosen from 1600 words each of which was reported on by at least sixteen college students or graduates is presented below. The numerical values for the different words are not strictly comparable, since the numbers of men and of women, of old and of young, of teachers of English and of persons having slight literary interest, differs from word to word and differs greatly in some words. But the general impression left by the list will be entirely trustworthy.

It shows clearly and emphatically that

[1] The correlation between G score and S score corrected for attenuation was in fact perfect for a random sample of 80 words, and the "raw" correlation between the G score from 32 teachers of English and the S score from 32 other persons, also teachers of English, was .97.

the attitudes associated with the words in past experiences of them mainly determine likes and dislikes. Words which have been accompanied by dignity, grandeur, beauty, charm, health, vigor, cleanliness, success, joy, freedom and the like, real or imagined, sound well to us. It shows clearly that records of likings for the sounds of real words are an extremely inefficient means to reveal the intrinsic pleasantness or unpleasantness of sounds. Many sorts of sounds appear both in those most liked and those most disliked. If differences did appear, we should have to allow for possible differences in their past associations, a very difficult task.

Likings for words (sound alone): the words whose sounds were most liked and most disliked by college students and graduates

S Average balance	
+15	harmony madonna melody
+14	Endymion lily lullaby lyrical regal resonant serene silvery swan
+13	alpha alpine clarion ebony fantasy fragrant gallant garland gondola Havana haven India Jericho lavender lilac loyal radiant revere sapphire sherry sonata sparkle splendor starry tranquil vista vesper
+12	aglow Andes anemone blossom bobolink caravan caress carol castle cavalier chalice core daffodil dawn elfin epic ermine fairyland fascination Geneva gleam Hercules immemorial ivory laurel leaf linen love mandarin mandolin promenade rendezvous serenade slumber tapestry tendril tingle tulip twinkle valiant violet volley
+11	adorable adore amber arabesque Ariosto artesian artistic auburn ballad Bethlehem brilliant cedar clover columbine coral damsel debonair delta elysian emerald facility fiancée firmament foamy foliage folio fragile fraternal Galilee gaze gazelle glen halo harpoon hazel hyacinth immensity jade jasmine Java jubilant labyrinth laureate limpid lustre Madeira magnolia manoeuver manorial narrative opal Pantheon paramour quaint resplendent rosary sagamore Samoa sanctuary scarlet shell silvan tang terrace topaz tower trophy troubadour vintage violin willowy
− 4	accompt ache addle arnica artichoke bastard beadle beg behemoth bib boggy bossy bumper buttocks cankerworm chunk clutch cribbage daub douse dowager gabble gewgaw habergeon hack hook jag liverwort morgue mucous ogre rancid rat rut sackcloth sag satchel sauerkraut spigot
− 5	antichrist asexual asp asphyxia astute brackish cackle carboy chew collop concupiscence cuspidor dandruff dank diabetes dub dyspeptic egg fagged fake flabby fodder hawser hoist hulk hussy irk junk libbard lockjaw lump Meg rot ruder rump scum scurvy soggy steapsin ulcer
− 6	arch-duke blether bum clack corset defunct drug fag fatty fetter forger gibber haggis lobster nasal ogle pip punk shank slicker spavin spinach whore yelp
− 7	bosky[2] cad corpse croak gaff gopher hank hump husk itch maugre pimp sewage sick skunk
− 8	apse asthma bug clumsy diarrhoea hog mickle muck mumps stench
− 9	abduct ague gad sackbut slop
−10	skulk spittoon
−11	ain't cockroach funk hunk mawkish punk squawk vomit wart
−12	brat stink
−13	abut belch

[2] It seems probable that many of the subjects in the groups that rated *bosky* did not know what the word meant.

Experiments with Nonsense Words and Unknown Names of Persons and Places

We may reduce the influence of meaning and associations by using nonsense words or unknown names of people and

places. The facts so obtained will not be entirely free from indirect influence from the meanings and associations of real words that the nonsense words or unknown words resemble in sound, but they will be instructive.

I used three lists, two of 160 words each and one of 303 words.

List I contained 160 words, announced as "foreign words," consisting of

(A) some rich in liquids and open vowels

(B) some rich in aspirates, gutterals, and combinations hard to pronounce

(C) a few that duplicated real words in sound (e.g. ainshunt (en'ʃənt), ebbuni (ɛ'bənɪ), fabul (fe'bəl), and idil (aɪ'dɪl)

(D) some that duplicated real words in sound except for a small addition, subtraction, or substitution, e.g. darmunny (dɑr'mənɪ), and garlent (gɑr'lənt), and

(E) some made by random pairing of certain syllables.

TABLE 1

The relative frequency of certain sounds in much liked and much disliked nonsense words of Lists I and II

Sound	Occurrences per 100 in words scoring +4 or better / Occurrences per 100 in words scoring −2 or worse
ə	3.8
l	2.9
r	2.9
ɑ (as in father)	2.8
o (as in coat)	2.0
t	1.7
d	1.6
m	1.6
v	1.5
e (as in bait)	1.3
n	1.1
b	1.1
i (as in machine)	1.0
ɔ (as in law)	0.9½
ʌ	0.9
s	0.8
ɛ (as in let)	0.7
ɪ (as in pin)	0.6
æ (as in fat)	0.6
p	0.4
g	0.3½
k	0.3½
ŋ (ng in sing)	0.33
ʃ (sh in shun)	0.32
f	0.24
dʒ (j in judge)	0.20

Three-fourths of the list were words of classes A, B and E, so that the subjects as a rule did not expect any real English words in the experiment or often think of resemblances to English words.

List II contained 160 words, announced as "names of persons or places," consisting of a few well-known names

(e.g. Lincoln, Paris, Quebec, Aristotle), a few other real names (e.g. Schurz, Torrey, Bloom, Jonas), some fictitious names of Classes A, B, C, and D described above, plus a majority of Class E described above.

Lists I and II were presented to some subjects as sounds alone, and to others as typed words which the subject heard the experimenter pronounce, but could also see and say to himself in inner speech. Each word was rated LL, L, O, D, or DD by the scale used for real words. I use as a measure of the degree of liking the number of likes minus the number of dislikes in a group of sixteen subjects, just as was done in the case of real words.

Table 1 shows the relative frequency of certain sounds in the liked and in the disliked nonsense words of Lists I and II. The neutral vowel heads the table and occurs 3.8 times as often in much liked as in much disliked words; l, r, and ɑ are next with ratios of 2.9, 2.9, and 2.8.

Another way to measure the pleasantness of sounds as heard in words is to compare the scores of nonsense words alike in all respects save the sound in question. List III contained 303 words each consisting of combinations of sounds chosen with no regard for likeness to real words.[3] The list included many pairs and sets of four like those shown above. The words in any such pair or set were scattered among many others, so that no hearer would become aware of any set or pair as such. All but a few of the words of List III were accented on the first syllable. List III was heard but not seen by the 60 subjects, all students at Brooklyn College.

LIST III

	zɑnto	zɛnto	
	sɑnto	sɛnto	
	ʃɑnto	ʃɛnto	
	lɑnto	lɛnto	
ɑmus	ɛmus	ɔmus	ɔɪmus
ɑnuʃ	ɛnuʃ	ɔnuʃ	ɔɪnuʃ
mɑkraɪ	mɛkraɪ	mɔkraɪ	mɔɪkraɪ
lɑkrɛd	lɛkrɛd	lɔkrɛd	lɔɪkrɛd

The difference between one sound and another in making the total sound of a word liked varies greatly according to which pair of words is used in the comparison. For example, ɑ–ɛ gives the following differences in the different pairs of words alike in all save that one sound: 4.8, 4.4, 3.8, 3.0, 2.9, 2.1, 2.0, 1.3, 1.0, 0.8,

TABLE 2

The difference in score caused by substituting the sound listed at the top for the sound listed at the right.

	ɔ (law)	ɑ (ah)	ɛ (let)	o (coat)	u (rule)	ɔɪ (high)
ɑ	0.6					
ɛ	1.6	1.5				
u				o		
aɪ				0.1	−0.1	
ɔɪ[4]	4.2	2.0	1.1	0.8	1.6	1.0

[3] There were, however, a few among the 303 that happened to resemble real words to a considerable extent (e.g. sis'-ɪŋ).

[4] ɔɪ does not occur as the final sound of any of the words compared.

0.2, 0.2, −0.1, −0.4, −0.8, −0.9. The average is 1.5, but it is not very reliable. And this is true of all the comparisons, in spite of the fact that sixty persons rated every word. More than two or three sets are needed to obtain reliable differences.

Doing the best we can with what information we have and taking as an arbitrary zero a value 1.3 below the average

TABLE 3

The average superiorities of certain sounds to others as measured by the superiorities in liking of words alike in all else save the sound in question. Each entry is an average from a set of four comparisons. Each entry is the superiority of the sound listed above it to the sound listed at the left of it.

	b	d	f	g	k	l	m	n	s	z
f	2.4									
	0.5									
g		2.2								
		2.1								
k		2.6		−1.8						
		0.3								
m			−5.8							
n	1.6		−3.9	−0.6			1.0			
							1.9			
ŋ (ng)			−1.2				2.3	0.5		
			−3.5							
r						0.8				
s	−3.6			−2.3		0.4		−2.0		
						1.8				
						1.9				
t	1.1	−0.2		−2.2	−0.4	−0.3			−2.1	
z						5.2			4.8	
						3.2			1.3	
ʃ (sh)						2.9			2.5	−2.3
						2.3			0.4	−0.9

We have averages of comparisons of ɔ, ɑ, ɛ, o, u, and aɪ with ɔɪ, of ɔ and ɑ with ɛ, of ɔ and ɑ, of o and u with aɪ, and of o with u as shown in Table 2.

All are from eight pairs of words except ɔ with ɔɪ, which is from four, and ɑ with ɛ, which is from sixteen.

We have also ɑ averaging 0.5 better than i by four pairs and i averaging 1.4 better than ɪ by four pairs.

The facts for b, d, f, g, k, l, m, n, ŋ, r, s, t, z and ʃ are presented in Table 3, each entry of which is the average difference found for four pairs of words. Consequently when eight pairs were available the table has two entries. For example, *b* versus *f* gave 2.4 in one set of four pairs and 0.5 in the other. There were three sets of four pairs each for *l* versus *s*, giving 0.4, 1.8 and 1.9 respectively, of d, l, and s, we have a fairly good fit to the facts of Table 3 by the following:

b =	0.4	ŋ (ng) =	−0.5
d =	1.3	r =	0.5
f =	−1.0	s =	1.3
g =	−1.0	t =	1.0
k =	0.6	z =	−2.2
l =	1.3	ʃ (sh) =	−0.7
m =	0.8		
n =	0		

These differences are not great. For example, replacing u by ɑ or ʃɑ by l means only a change of two persons in sixteen from dislike to indifference or from indifference to liking; or a change of one person in sixteen from dislike to liking.

In spite of the large number of nonsense words and of persons judging them, the ranking of sounds by this method does not give a clear and reliable picture. The rankings of Tables 2 and 3 do not correspond closely with the rankings of

Table 1. The correlation is .75 for the thirteen consonants represented in both rankings, and .64 for the seven vowel sounds. The best estimate (for the consonants) from both methods combined puts l first, d, t, r closely alike in second place, then s and m, then b, n, and k, then ŋ, with f, g, and ʃ clearly at the bottom, with a substantial probability that z also is very low. For the vowel sounds the combined information puts ɑ first, then ɔ, i, and o, then ɛ, with ɪ and u last.

Much more work must be done in order to determine the preferences of American hearers; and I have some reason to believe that French, German, Russian and Finnish groups might differ notably from the American group.

Concerning the explanation of the preferences of the American group among single sounds as heard in nonsense words, it appears likely that ease in production and ease in perception contribute as well as some sheer pleasantness of the sound comparable to the pleasantness of colors, odors, and tastes.

ESCAPIST THEATRE IN WARTIME

JOHN DOLMAN, JR.
University of Pennsylvania

ALONG with at least a few others, I have a bit of concern over some things that are happening to our arts, and particularly to our theatre, in wartime.

Commercially, of course, the theatre is flourishing. Even the little theatres are better attended than ever before, in spite of the OPA; and but for the dearth of men for casting purposes and the shortage of many needed materials, they would be in a happy state of prosperity.

In one other respect, also, the theatre is flourishing, and that is as an agency of patriotic effort and propaganda. About this I cannot be altogether happy, though I recognize it as inevitable, and some phases of it as harmless. Two phases are distinctly praiseworthy. One is the entertainment of service men with good theatre, whether in the theatres themselves or in the camps. The other is the scheduling of extra performances or extra productions for the benefit of war charities or war bond sales. Much less praiseworthy is the distortion of art for propaganda purposes, which may or may not be good patriotism, but is certainly a backward step in the history of art.

It is a striking characteristic of Americans that as soon as an emergency occurs everybody begins devoting a large part of his energies to telling everybody else what to do about it. We all become teachers—if not preachers—each assuming that it is the other fellow who needs educating. That is why there is a paper shortage and a manpower shortage. The energy used up in one day by Americans telling other Americans not to be "complacent" (as a father of sons in action I could brain the next person who uses that word to me!) would build a battleship. Why does every American assume that his fellow citizens are less patriotic or less aware than he? That they will not buy bonds unless he urges them to? That they will not give their blood to the Red Cross unless he writes a play about it and harrows their emotions? All this ballyhoo is fast building up in our people a kind of cynical sales resistance —a dangerous feeling that nobody is really expected to do his part until somebody else high-pressures him.

I am not too much disturbed when our

best painters take time out to "do commercials" on such abstract ideas as the Four Freedoms. As it happens, some of the paintings have been good. Nor am I at all disturbed when children in the schools are encouraged to dramatize their lessons in history, including current history. It is right that they should go through the more primitive stages of art as part of their educational development. But it is disturbing when responsible college and community theatres are asked to insult adult audiences with drivel like *Fun To Be Free*, or with synthetic propaganda plays obviously intended solely to make people buy bonds or give blood in a moment of emotional hysteria. This sort of thing is of a piece with the Morgenthau movies and the sophomoric radio propaganda put out by the OWI, and has the same ring of insincerity which makes American short-wave broadcasting disgraceful by comparison with the British or the Russian. It suggests a lack of national dignity and good taste.

What disturbs me most, however, in the present state of the theatre, is the growing misconception of what constitutes good theatre in wartime, not as propaganda but as art. It is the notion that we must put aside all serious art and seek escape in triviality.

II

Escapism in art is not, in itself, necessarily bad. All pure art, by definition, represents a turning aside from the main business of survival to the enjoyment of leisure time and of imaginative mental and emotional play. Inevitably it implies some kind of refuge from, or release from, the cares of life. Very trivial people will always find their release in very trivial forms of play; but people of developed mentality and sensitive feelings normally find theirs in art which has truth and beauty.

To be sure, even the best minds like to go on vacation now and then; to enjoy some sort of frankly inconsequential exercise such as that of reading detective stories or going to bad movies. The late Dr. Josiah Penniman used to say that he went to the movies periodically because he felt that it was good for him to have his intelligence insulted. Many people read detective stories in the same spirit. Others read them as they would play cards or do cross-word puzzles, just for intellectual exercise; they do not mistake them for important literature, nor regard them as a substitute for the deeper enjoyment of truth and beauty. In the theatre, many people who enjoy the best there is, also go now and then to see a mystery thriller or a slap-stick farce without much regard to its quality and without taking it too seriously. It does them no harm.

But what happens in wartime? Do we take our theatre in normal proportions —trivial things for trivial people, finer things for more civilized people, with occasional moments of pure diversion? I am afraid we do not. I am afraid we carry escapism to the point of cheapness —even of cowardice.

Now and then, of course, one happens upon an encouraging sign. The other day I was talking to a friend who had just been to see a musical review. He is not a theatre-wise person, nor particularly intellectual, but he said, apologetically, "I just went to please the wife and some friends. Oh, it was entertaining—very light, you know—but I don't care much for that kind of thing; seems so silly and unimportant right now!"

If everybody felt that way I should not be writing this article. But he is the only one I have run across. Most of my friends, and most of the people I overhear in theatre lobbies or elsewhere are saying exactly the opposite. People who in normal times might be expected to have a fairly strong stomach for the best in art, music, and drama are saying,

"Let's keep it light! Let's not have anything tragic or serious; there's enough of sorrow and pain in real life. Let's have plenty of light music, plenty of belly laughs. Let's forget the war as much as we can." There may be less of this kind of escapism than in World War I, but there is plenty. The worst of it is that it is contagious. One hears others talking that way, and the first thing he knows he is saying it himself.

III

I am sure that every person who has to do with the selection of plays for school, college, or community theatres has felt the pressure of this attitude. It is not just that people prefer comedy to tragedy in wartime. I can understand and sympathize with that; as a matter of fact I happen to prefer comedy myself, even in time of peace. But the popular feeling today seems to be that escape is to be found chiefly in the abandonment of standards. People who should know better seem to feel that they can find refuge from their worries by indulging in what is trashy or third rate. If only they can put their brains to sleep for two hours, and bellow with gregarious laughter at the raw jokes of a Broadway review or the physical humor of slapstick farce, they imagine it will boost their morale.

There is, of course, no reason why people who prefer such things in peacetime should not prefer them in wartime also, and no reason why they should be deprived of them by any form of censorship. But there is every reason why people of better taste should not be encouraged to throw away their standard in a vain effort to escape reality, and why the people who still prefer what is beautiful, or sincere, or genuinely witty, should not be deprived of it through the censorship of mass hysteria.

The most important reason for keeping the arts alive and at their best during this particular war is the fact that the war itself began as an attack on the democratic concept of civilization. Nazi philosophy is symbolized by the burning of books. Ours is symbolized by the Four Freedoms—though I can think of at least six. The most important freedom is freedom of ideas, including freedom of the arts. Freedom of the arts implies the right of every artist to present his observation of life—as it is, or as he thinks it ought to be—and the right of each observer to select what appeals to him and ignore what does not. No gain that we have made, either in freedom or quality, should be allowed to deteriorate, for the very reason that our arts stand as the symbol of what we are determined to defend. If, even temporarily, we accept the idea that those arts are to exclude everything but propaganda on the one hand and triviality on the other we have lost the ideational phase of the war.

Perhaps we should be less apt to do so, if we gave more careful thought to the true nature of escape in art.

IV

Is it really true that the best surcease of sorrow is to be found in an evening of carefree hilarity and forgetfulness? For those who, in the best of times, are incapable of enjoying anything better—yes. For the rest of us—no.

To be sure, an evening spent in light entertainment is not likely to do anybody any real harm—not unless the kind of entertainment is so very cheap and unworthy as to leave a strong after-taste of shame. Let us concede that entertainment in itself is good, and laughter a healthy reaction. But at best, all it does is relax the nerves for awhile and provide a few hours of escape from reality. What happens when the curtain comes down, the last laugh dies away, and we go out again to face the cold hard facts of a world at war?

I can tell you what happens to me. The war comes back on me with redoubled grimness. I say to myself, "Oh, Lord! We're still at war! I've been fooling away time in senseless laughter, while my sons are enduring hardships and risking their lives abroad. I've been an ostrich, sticking my head in the sand. I've been acting as if there were no war; and there is a war—a real war!" Somehow the clouds seem blacker and the dread in my heart more crushing than before the escapist interlude began. I feel like the Emperor Jones, running away from disaster only to find the drums of doom growing louder and louder.

V

Is there any better sort of escape? I think there is. For me, the shock of the return to reality is lessened in proportion to the worthiness of the recreation, and the permanency of its implications. If I can see a play so true, so moving, so witty, so universal that it seems to transcend the temporary worries of war, or that faces the steeps of life with some comforting philosophy which I can take home with me after the curtain is down, it seems to me that I have found a kind of escape that is not cheap or cowardly and that is much more lasting in its effect.

This kind of solace is not to be found in war plays alone, nor in serious plays alone.

Most of the war plays so far have been too much concerned with the melodrama of war, or its heroics, and few, if any, have been good enough in quality to have any suggestion of permanency about them. On the whole they either harrow the feelings to no good purpose, or their insincerity leaves one cold. *The Eve of St. Mark,* generally acclaimed the best play of this war, was a disappointment to me. I saw it in the Broadway production, to which I went with some fear of being emotionally disturbed; one of my sons had just landed in Morocco with General Patton, and another was in Archangel after going through the worst convoy battle of 1942. But the overacting of the Broadway company, the obtrusive rumble of the revolving stage, and the general atmosphere of forced emotion left my eyes quite dry. I have no doubt that it was a better play as done in some of the non-commercial theatres for which it was written. Certainly it is more philosophical in purpose than most of the war plays have been, and more concerned with beauty. But it gave me no lift.

The idea that only serious or solemn plays are important is one that makes no appeal to me in war or peace. If I seem to suggest that brainless laughter is a shallow thing I do not mean to disparage *brainy* laughter in the least. For me, the imperishable humor of *The School for Scandal,* the inspired poetic nonsense of *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* and the happy combination of sparkling music and incomparable wit of *Patience* or *The Mikado* make them just as indispensable a part of the theatre as the profound introspection of *Hamlet* or the poetic grandeur of *King Lear.* And in war time they give me exactly the same feeling of renewed confidence in the lasting power of good things. As long as people can chuckle with delight at the penetrating wisdom and universality of *The Taming of the Shrew, The Inspector General,* or *The Pirates of Penzance,* or can ponder with thoughtful sympathy the anguish of *Electra* or *Othello,* our culture will survive the ravages of the Huns, and the sacrifices we must make to defend it will seem worth-while.

VI

To be sure, even those who are well read and theatre-wise do not always agree upon what is a worthy play. Heaven forbid that I should be one to suggest an exclusively literary or academic stand-

ard, or to imply that anybody who goes to see a play not on an approved reading list is a cheap escapist. The question is not what the play has done to some professor of English, but what it does to you or me individually. For me, the best test of a play is the degree of affection I have for it after I have seen it a number of times, and particularly after I have worked with it for six or eight weeks of rehearsal for production. Many plays not on the academic list stand up under this test surprisingly well, and some that are on the list do not, if one recollects that the direction of a play for production is equivalent to reading it at least thirty times, he will realize that a director can become a very severe critic, and that a play has to have some abiding qualities of excellence to survive in his good graces. Often a "great" play turns out to be also a very imperfect play, with distressing inconsistencies and bothersome flaws. *Twelfth Night* is such a play, though I still like it for its good points. On the other hand *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is a better and more consistent play than its literary critics allow it to be. More than once, to oblige others, I have undertaken the production of what I thought was a trifling play, only to find unexpected truth and values in it. *Erstwhile Susan* is like that, though it also includes a good deal of hokum. One play, generally rated the second best play of a minor author, impressed me after eight weeks of intensive study as the most perfectly written play in my experience; every word and line seemed to be exactly in place and incapable of the slightest improvement, and I felt no impulse to rewrite—an unheard of thing for a confirmed director! That play was *The Dover Road*, by A. A. Milne. It is a light, satirical comedy, making no pretentions to greatness; but among plays of its kind it is a gem of skilled workmanship.

most likely to give one the more lasting kind of relief in wartime, is that which involves some power of symbolism, some poetic feeling (not necessarily expressed in verse form), and perhaps some degree of abstraction. Such a play can suggest the beauty and timelessness that one finds in great music, or in religion.

No play has helped me, personally, more than Saroyan's *Jim Dandy*, familiar to most NATS members, many of whom have produced it. I do not know whether Saroyan will ultimately be rated a great author, or *Jim Dandy* a great play; and I do not care. But the play does have poetic feeling, symbolism, universality, timelessness, and abstraction. Its modernism and realism are superficial; basically it exhibits a little group of confused human beings, symbolic of us all, groping their way through the familiar but still inexplicable experiences of this life, and finally responding to the bells that say, "Come home, come home!" It has beauty of composition, following the form of a Beethoven symphony, and it has delicacy, restraint, sympathy, and compassion.

A play like this—or one like *Our Town*, or *Cradle Song*, or *Macbeth*, or *Dear Brutus*, or *The Yellow Jacket*—leaves one with a sense of the continuity of life and the universality of human experience, and restores his faith in the best side of human nature. It helps him to regain his sense of proportion and to realize that this is a big world and a bigger universe, that wars do not last forever, and that his own troubles are only a small part of the cosmos. It does not weakly shut the door on life for two hours; rather it opens a larger door, and lets him see life in a broader perspective, and so helps him to meet it more calmly and bravely. It does not fool him, even for two hours, into thinking he can dodge reality, but it does help him to adjust himself to reality, and its prob-

getfulness at the moment, but it gives him something more lasting to take home with him when the curtain is down.

When my boys in the service write home, they say over and over again: "Keep the home activities alive, and as nearly normal as you can. What we need most is the feeling that the way of life we are fighting for will be there waiting for us when we get back!" I know that other fathers receive similar pleas from their sons.

To keep faith with them, we need not go suddenly highbrow or seek to make third-rate people appreciate first-rate art; but we should hold the line at all points, refusing to lower our own standards. Honest enjoyment of what we enjoyed before, each according to his taste, is consistent with this view. Frantic and unusual escapism is not.

THE AMERICAN INDIAN PLAYS

L. M. EICH
University of Michigan

A WELL-NIGH forgotten episode in the history of the American theatre is constituted in the series of American Indian plays which swept the stage, particularly during the middle section of the nineteenth century. While very few of the forty-odd plays on Indian themes have come down to us, there are ample records of their popularity in the theatres of the day. No town that considered itself at all a "theatre town" would close its theatrical season without a visit from a company playing *Pocahontas, Hiawatha, Osceola,* or some other Indian play. Naturally, there were several on the Pocahontas theme. Playwrights would be attracted by that "big scene." This is how it is handled by George Washington Parke Custis who, in 1830, produced his play *Pocahontas or the Settlers of Virginia.*[1] Captain Smith is the prisoner of Powhatan, father of Pocahontas, and king of his tribe. In spite of his daughter's pleas, Powhatan orders the execution of Smith. As the stage directions have it:

Smith, exhausted, sinks into the arms of the Indians, who bind him, and lay his head on the stone of sacrifice.

And then:

Powhatan: Executioners, I shall wave my fan of feathers thrice, and then cry strike. When you hear that word, let fall your weapons and with all your force. Now attend—once, twice—

(Waves the fan of feathers, Pocahontas breaks from her guard, and rushes to the feet of the king.)

Pocahontas: King—father, if ever thy poor child found favour in thy sight, spare, O spare the noble prisoner; 'tis Pocahontas, thy darling, who entreats thee—her, whom from infancy thou hast cherished in thy bosom. Spare, spare; here will I embrace thy feet, till thou shalt forget the king, and once again be the father.

Powhatan: Away, girl—away.

(Executioners raise their clubs.)

Pocahontas: (Rising with dignity.) Attend but first to me. Cruel king, the ties of blood which bound me to thee are dissever'd, as have been long those of thy sanguinary religion; for know that I have abjured thy senseless gods and now worship the Supreme Being, the true Manitou, and Father of the Universe; 'tis his Almighty hand that sustains me, 'tis his divine spirit that breathes in my soul, and prompts Pocahontas to a deed which future ages will admire.

(She rushes down from the throne, throws herself on the body of Smith, raises her arms, and calls to the executioners to "Strike"; they drop their weapons. Powhatan descends, raises up and embraces his daughter.)

Powhatan: I am subdued; unbind the prisoner. My child, my child.

(Smith is unbound, and kneels to the Princess.)

[1] Taken from Quinn, A. H., *Representative American Plays* (1917). Quoted lines are on pp. 206 and 207, Act III, Scene 5, the closing scene of the play.

The reader can readily imagine the frequent interruptions of applause that greeted these heroic lines in 1830. No wonder the title page of the play states that it was performed at the Walnut Street Theatre, Philadelphia, twelve nights (a long run in those days) with great success.

II

But by far the most popular of all the Indian dramas was *Metamora or The Last of the Wampanoags*, by John Augustus Stone, first produced in 1829, and holding the stage consistently for about forty years. The play is, of course, chiefly associated with the greatest of our melodramatic tragedians, Edwin Forrest. The story of the writing of *Metamora*, oft told, will bear brief repetition. The dependence of the American theatre in that day upon plays by English writers and upon translations of German and French plays is well known. Even though the golden age of American literature was developing, there was scarcely any activity in the way of playwrighting. Doubtless, Puritan antipathy to theatricals was partly responsible, but there was little financial encouragement, either, to dramatists—what with lax copyright laws, and royalties largely a voluntary matter on the part of producers. Forrest understood and appreciated this situation. For selfish reasons, no doubt, but also because of patriotic motives, he offered prizes for native plays he could produce. Above all, Forrest was looking for the role of an Indian chieftain that would suit his talents and his vigorous melodramatic style of acting. He was delighted with Stone's play, and Metamora became the character in his repertoire most called for by the general public. It was the role that netted Forrest the bulk of his considerable fortune. He played Metamora for many years and in every part of the country. After his death in 1872, the part was continued by other prominent actors.

Yet, in spite of this popularity, no copy of the play could be found when Barrett H. Clark and his associate editors wished to include it in *America's Lost Plays*,[2] that rich mine of valuable material for research in the early American theatre. According to Clark, the only resource available was Forrest's manuscript name part, his lines and cues, which was located among the relics at the Forrest home in Holmesburg, Pennsylvania. Finally, through the good offices of Maude May Babcock and George S. Pyper, a manuscript copy (but minus the fourth act), was discovered in Salt Lake City. By piecing together the two manuscripts, Clark was able to give us the fairly complete version that appears in the *Lost Plays*.

As one would expect, knowing Forrest, the play is largely a vehicle for Metamora's grandiloquent speeches to his followers and to the white men. To the opening of slow music the curtain rises to show a picturesque scene, high craggy rocks in the distance and dark pine trees in the foreground. Metamora is addressing Englishmen who have come to negotiate for the lands of the Wampanoags:

> Metamora has been the friend of the white man; yet if the flint be smitten too hard it will show that in its heart is fire. The Wampanoag will not wrong his white brother, who comes from the land that is first touched by the rising sun; but he owns no master, save that one who holds the sun in his right hand, who rides on the dark storm and who cannot die.

Throughout the play Metamora makes speeches to his followers revealing his suspicion of the white man:

> When we are hunted back like the wounded elk far toward the going down of the sun, our hatchets broken, our bows un-

[2] *America's Lost Plays*, ed. by Barrett H. Clark, 20 volumes (Princeton University Press, 1940). Is this splendid reference being used as it should be by teachers of speech?

strung, *then* will the stranger *spare* for we will be too small for his eye to see.

The white leader appeals to the Indian chief:

> Chieftain, sell your lands to us and seek another biding place.

And Metamora answers:

> And if I did, would you not stretch out your hand to seize that also?—No, white man, No! Never will Metamora forsake the home of his fathers, and let the plough of the strangers disturb the bones of his kindred.

Again, in Act III he stirs up his followers:

> When the strangers came from afar off, they were like a little tree; but now they are grown up and their spreading branches threaten to keep the light from you. Oh my people, the race of the red man has fallen away like the trees of the forest before the axes of the palefaces.

The last act has much red fire, burning of villages in the distance, thunder and lightning. The play is almost a monologue; the other characters are just foils to let Metamora (i.e. Edwin Forrest) display his powers as an orator and an actor of the melodramatic type.

At the close of Act V, Metamora is executed by the white soldiers and as he falls he gasps:

> Spirits of the grave, I come. But the curse of Metamora stays with the white man.

III

Such, then, was the most popular of the American Indian plays. Like *Pocahontas* and the others, they constitute an episode in the history of the American theatre. To the present-day reader, they are amusing, or just a mass of melodramatic tripe and badinage. Perhaps they illustrate the need of reading such plays with some measure of historic perspective, for they serve as proof and example that drama evolves out of the interests of the times. Let us note how the writers of Indian drama were catering to public interests.

Through most of the nineteenth century, interest in the Indians was at a high level, as was manifested in a huge mass of writings. Continuous difficulties with the Indians, as new lands of the West were opened to occupation, the activities of the so-called "Indian agents," the treatment of the Creek Indians in Georgia, the wars with the Seminoles in Florida, the various stages of the final transfer of the Indians to the reservations beyond the Mississippi—these matters were constantly in the public mind, and writings of every type and attitude were inspired by the situation. Long after the fear of actual contact with the Indian, of being scalped, had passed, the interest continued.

In fact, the figure of the Indian becomes enshrouded in the legendary and romantic haze that made him all the more attractive and appealing. There were a large number of ethnological treatises on the origin of the American Indian. In these looms the "lost tribe of Israel" theory. Works on the language of the tribes, their customs, traditions, and legends were numerous. One of the most authoritative writers on the ethnological phases was Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, a government agent who operated in the region of Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and who secured the session of something like sixteen million acres of land to the United States. Schoolcraft's attitude toward the Indian was one of respect and admiration.[3] In fact, he married the daughter of an Indian chief.

But the attitude toward the Indian as it is expressed in learned dissertations, fiction, poetry, and plays varies between

[3] A much needed biography of Schoolcraft has recently been published by Chase S. Osborn, former Governor of Michigan: Osborn, C. S., and S. Osborn, *Schoolcraft, Longfellow, Hiawatha* (Jaques Cattell Press, Lancaster, Pa., 1942). The perennial controversy as to the source of Longfellow's material for *Hiawatha* is presented here at some length.

extremes. What one might call the military reaction is well summed up in the remark that General Philip Henry Sheridan is said to have made: "The only good Indians I ever saw were dead." The army had the job of fighting the tribes and of cleaning them out of the districts turned over to white settlers. No doubt it was a messy job. To the military the Indians were just a nuisance. At the other extreme, sentiments such as the following lament on the passing of the Indian were heard frequently:

> Here lived and loved another race of beings. Beneath the same sun that rolls over our heads, the Indian hunter pursued the panting deer. The Indian falcon glance and lion bearing, the theme of the touching ballad, the hero of this pathetic tale, is gone. (From a Fourth of July oration, 1825, by Charles Sprague, author and orator.)

In fiction, poetry, and plays the feeling toward the Indian was, as one would expect, largely sympathetic. After pilfering their lands, breaking promises and treaties, well nigh exterminating the race and then, as the crowning insult, transporting the few thousand remaining to those bleak lands beyond the Mississippi, the inevitable wave of reaction followed. The American people were swept by a tide of sentiment and sentimentality toward the Indian which was expressed by many authors. In poetry the peak of idealization was attained by Longfellow in *Hiawatha*. Published in 1855, the poem at once sprang into popular favor. Throughout the nineteenth century Indian stories and novels were turned out, from the books of James Fenimore Cooper, with his bad but also super good Indians, to the work of Helen Hunt Jackson who climaxed the sentimental attitude in her *Ramona*. Mrs. Jackson had become interested in the wrongs of the Indians in the 1880's, and had written a scathing denunciation of their treatment in a book entitled *A Century of Dishonor*. Of the popularity of *Romona* even the young folk of today can testify. In addition to the numerous expressions of sympathy in fiction, there were the love songs about Indian maidens, with jet black hair, flitting through the forest like the roe! (Or was it the antelope?)

And, as we have seen, there were plays. The dramatists watched the theatrical market and studied the public mind. Such topics as slavery, reconstruction, and the exploitation of labor, were more vital and more pressing than the Indian. But they were also more explosive. Whatever point of view presented, many theatre goers would be alienated, theatre business would be affected. How much simpler and more profitable to convert the romanticized Indian stories into "good theatre," acceptable to all patrons, enjoyed by all.

Such were the source and setting of the American Indian plays. They were not an important section of American drama, but the picture of the American theatre is not complete without them. We should read them today in that spirit of tolerance which comes from an understanding of their historical background.

THE JUNIOR-HIGH-SCHOOL SPEECH TEACHER

EDWARD BURT LONGERICH AND MARY COATES-LONGERICH
Los Angeles, California

NELLIE, stop tugging at your blouse. Do you want to look like a sweater girl?" demanded Miss Blythe irritably. "You know how often I've told you a speaker should stand up straight and throw out his chest." A wave of crimson spread rapidly over Nellie's face and tears welled in her eyes. Miss Blythe's correction only made Nellie more self-conscious about her physical development.

Miss Beam in Meadborough Junior High School was a successful educator, and admired by her pupils. Unlike Miss Blythe, she made a thorough study of adolescent[1] problems. On the day her freckled-face pupil, Jane, seemed embarrassed about taking the lead in the play because of vivid birthmarks on her face, Miss Beam quickly sensed the situation and suggested that some of the children pretend to be radio speakers. The pupils then presented their poems at the back of the room in order that the class might decide which speakers used the best voice quality and enunciation.

Later, during the semester when lanky, red-haired Jim got up to speak and found that all he could do was produce alternate squeals and bellows, Miss Beam complimented Jim by remarking, "Why, you can produce two kinds of voices! How would you like to select two of your favorite movie characters, then prepare a skit utilizing the two kinds of voices?" Instead of Jim's developing a self-consciousness about his voice-change, he gradually built up a confidence in himself and in his ability.

[1] *Adolescent*, as the term is generally used by psychologists today, refers to that period of the individual's life between childhood and adulthood, in which he achieves a physiological maturity and a certain measure of social independence.

II

To understand her pupils' problems, the junior-high-school teacher must "look at her pupils," study and analyze their characteristics, then determine their educational needs.

About two years ago, one of the authors[2] made an intensive study of the junior-high-school child.[3] In connection with the research, a thorough investigation was made of statistical evidence, professional opinions, and textbooks in the field of psychology and education in order that the physiological and psychological characteristics of the junior-high-school pupil might be determined. Then, from these data, conclusions were drawn relative to the child's physical development, interests, and abilities. Finally, a detailed course of study in speech was formulated to fit the pupil's needs.

This research revealed that the junior-high-school pupil manifests many of the "normal" metamorphic characteristics—depending, of course, upon the stage of development he is in, whether prepubertal, pubescent, or postpubertal.[4]

Growth studies[5] indicate that the

[2] Mary Coates, The Teaching of Speech in the Junior High School—A Program Based on a Study of the Physiological and Psychological Characteristics of the Junior High School Pupil (Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1942).

[3] According to educational authorities, children who rightfully belong in the three-year junior high school range primarily between the ages of 12 to 16. The average seventh-grade pupil is 12 or 13; the eighth-grade pupil is 13 or 14; and the ninth-grade pupil is 14, 15, or perhaps 16.

[4] Since the time of Crampton (1908) criteria for the designation of periods of development in boys have been three-fold: *prepubertal* being used to refer to those who have no pubic hair, *pubescent* to those who have pigmented, straight pubic hair, and *postpubertal* to those whose pigmented pubic hair has acquired a kink or twist. In the case of girls, psychologists make only a two-fold division—*prepubertal* being used to refer to those who have not reached menarche, and *postpubertal* to those who have attained menarche.

average child has a period of relatively slow growth sometime between the ages of 8 and 11. Then, just before puberty he experiences a growth spurt. This period of accelerated growth occurs approximately between the ages of 12 and 13½ in girls and 13½ to 15 in boys.

Furthermore, psychological data[6] show that certain bodily changes take place as the individual passes from the prepubertal to postpubertal stage of development:

1. The male testes and female ovaries begin to secrete hormones which have to do with reproduction.
2. A marked development takes place in the girl's hips and mammae; the entire body takes on a new fullness and grace of contour.
3. The boy's face tends to become harder and more angular.
4. The girl's face becomes softer and rounder.
5. The boy's beard begins to grow.
6. The girl may develop a slight semblance of a boy's beard.
7. The boy undergoes a change in voice.[7]

III

Some psychologists are of the opinion that when these fundamental changes take place, the child often misunderstands them and as a result is bewildered, embarrassed, awkward, and self-conscious.[8]

Similarly, other authorities say he may also become disturbed, if he hears his acquaintances make such tactless remarks as "Goodness, I wonder if Tom will ever stop growing. Don't you have trouble finding shoes large enough for him?" or "Why, can this be Susan? She used to be such an attractive child!"

Pressey says the child may have further feelings of strain and stress if he is made the butt of much ridicule about such things as sleeves or trouser legs that have become too short, wrists and ankles that are proportionally too thin, breasts or hips that are overdeveloped, or hands that are too large.[9] Likewise, the boy may be embarrassed about his downy beard, or about the squeaks and bass rumblings of his changing voice. The girl may be chagrined if she is chided about freckles and moles, or made the "center of covert and giggling curiosity" because of her first menstruation.[10]

The problem of "ideals" also is of vital importance to the child during this period. Instead of selecting an acquaintance for his "model" as he did in elementary years, the junior-high-school pupil tends to choose a contemporary great person or historical character as his "hero."[11]

Also, during this transition period, the junior-high-school child develops new abilities and interests. Psychological studies of Coleman,[12] Kangley,[13] Lehman and Witty[14] indicate the following to be the average:

1. The seventh grade—
   a. Boy or girl enjoys topics dealing with adventure, animals, home and school life.
   b. Boy or girl is interested in words and use of language.
   c. Boy or girl likes make-believe and guessing games.

[6] Herman G. Richey, "The Relation of Accelerated, Normal and Retarded Puberty to the Height and Weight of School Children." Cited in Frank K. Shuttleworth, "The Adolescent Period." *Monographs for Research in Child Development* (Washington, D.C.: National Research Council, 1938), Fig. 157.

[7] Shuttleworth, "The Adolescent Period," Fig. 96-105.

[8] Eldon K. Jerome, "Changes of Voice in Male Adolescents," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXIII (December, 1937), 649.

[9] S. L. Pressey, *Psychology and the New Education* (1933), p. 10-11.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[11] Estelle M. Darrah, "A Study of Children's Ideals," *Popular Science Monthly*, LIII (May, 1898), 88-98.

[12] J. H. Coleman, "Written Composition Interests of Junior and Senior High School Pupils," *Teachers College Contribution to Education* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931).

[13] Lucy Kangley, *Poetry Preferences in the Junior High School* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938), No. 758, 87.

[14] C. H. Lehman and P. A. Witty, *The Psychology of Play Activities* (1927), p. 242.

2. The eighth grade—
   a. Boy enjoys stories dealing with adventure, war, and scouting.
   b. Girl prefers books pertaining to home and school life, and how to get rich.
   c. Boy or girl is interested in topics dealing with manners, etiquette, religion, current events, and characters of national and city life.
3. The ninth grade—
   a. Boy likes competitive sports.
   b. Girl (postmenarcheal) enjoys games requiring little physical activity.
   c. Boy or girl is interested in books pertaining to adventure, travel, and romance.
   d. Boy or girl enjoys going to the movies.
   e. Boy or girls enjoys social dancing.

IV

Because the junior-high-school pupil is "in the making, both as an individual and as a member of society,"[15] he should have ample facilities for the exploration of his interests and abilities; he should have abundant opportunities to become familiar with the "affairs of men and women, their knowledge, their occupations, their standards and their ideals."[16] Moreover, he should have a teacher who is mature and well-balanced; one who is "aware of his feelings of strain and stress and is able to guide him without overt compulsion or restriction";[17] and one who has certain educational qualifications. According to Touton and Struthers,[18] the minimum requirements for a junior-high-school teacher should be a bachelor's degree with a major in the principal subject he is to teach; and in addition he should have the following courses:

1. Educational Psychology.
2. Problems in Adolescence.
3. Educational Tests and Measurements.
4. Essentials of Citizenship in a Democracy.
5. Principles of Junior High School Education.
6. Technique of Junior High School Teaching.
7. Junior High School Teacher's Course in the Principal Subject to be Taught.

It is obvious that some of the requirements listed above are applicable to the teacher of any age level; however, the majority of the qualifications are peculiarly suitable for the training of the junior high school teacher. For instance, such courses as Principles of Junior High School Education, Technique of Junior High School Teaching, and the Junior High School Teacher's Course in the Principal Subject to be Taught are more necessary for the adequate training of the junior-high-school teacher than for the teacher of the elementary, high school or college levels. Likewise, it is more essential for the junior high school teacher to have the course in Problems of Adolescence than it is for teachers of other age levels.

V

In addition to the junior-high-school pupil's need of a well-trained teacher, he needs also courses of study designed to aid in making necessary social and school adjustments.

In some respects, obviously every course in the junior-high-school curriculum can play its part in this development, but training in speech should be of particular value. This is true because the actual speech units, methods, and materials can be designed especially to develop the child's speech skills, to fit his social needs, and to develop his personality.

The eighth-grade child, for example, is especially interested in social manners, customs, and etiquette. This interest is the result of a definite and vital need felt by the child, and may be utilized as

[15] William A. Smith, *The Junior High School* (1930), p. 143.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 143.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 143.
[18] Frank C. Touton and Alice B. Struthers, *Junior High School Procedure* (1926), p. 23-24.

a driving, motivating force in teaching. To aid in satisfying this interest, a speech project in the form of a social party or tea may be planned. In preparation for this social event, the child may be taught how to greet people, how to introduce people, how to start conversations, and how to keep them from lagging. The development of these and similar abilities contribute to the feeling of confidence and assurance—qualities essential to proper growth.

Also, in connection with the study of social forms, skits and scenes relating to social customs may be prepared. In fact, a whole speech unit may be given over to social conversation, with a view to helping the child become socially adjusted,

Thus, the entire junior-high-school speech course might be planned, having as its main function the training of the pupil's speech skills in order to assist his adaptation to the society in which he lives.

It is our judgment that a speech course could be planned for every age level. But statistics show a general decrease in enrollment after the junior-high-school years, with an especially marked decline in some localities;[19] and therefore, *if the child is going to have speech training at all, he should be given it before leaving the junior high school.*

VI

As pointed out earlier, the average child of junior high school age is experiencing problems of growing up. Because of his feelings of embarrassment and awkwardness, we believe that at this time, rather than during his elementary years, should special emphasis be placed on the development of those speech and social skills that will aid him in social adjustment. Therefore, with these factors in mind, the following suggestions are made relative to planning a speech course on the junior-high-school level.

Because the seventh-grade pupil is beginning to substitute new adult interests for childhood interests, we suggest that he be given a semester's "broadening and finding course" to help him determine capacities and abilities, and to adjust himself to his new problems of growing up.

In this seventh-grade course, he can first be given training in *bodily freedom* in order to eliminate his feelings of strain, stress, and embarrassment, and to aid in developing self-confidence. Because he is especially interested in guessing games at his age, he may present "silent movies" and have the class guess what he is doing; or, similarly, he may pantomime advertisements and let pupils decide the name of the product being pantomimed. Also he may play posture games, and so learn to stand and look his best. All these activities contribute to his social adjustment.

Since the average seventh-grade pupil is interested in imaginative and make-believe games, a unit on *observation and imagination* may be given. He may have "spell-downs" in synonyms. He may play word games such as "Who am I?" and let the class guess his identity, or, he may give descriptive talks (descriptions of well-known buildings, parks, statues), and let the class decide what he has described.

To satisfy an interest in rhythm and group games, he may have training in *choral reading*. Also in line with this desire for cooperative play, he may participate in *creative dramatics*. This unit should especially help to relieve the feelings of self-consciousness, and aid in developing ability for self-expression.

In the eighth grade a child is beginning to feel even more grown-up than in

[19] Henry J. Gerling, "Educational Research and Statistics," *School and Society*, XLII (1935), 101-104.

the seventh; therefore, his speech course may be somewhat more formalized. The speech aim should be to train him to speak effectively in the classroom, in social situations, and before an audience. The first unit may be on *visible action.* Since eighth grade boys and girls tend more and more to have varied likes and dislikes, they may be allowed to give pantomimes, pertaining to their individual interests and preferences. The girls may give scenes dealing with home and school life, while the boys may present scenes depicting adventure, war, scouting, and other similar activities.

Because the eighth-grade pupil is beginning to realize the importance of speaking well, a unit on *voice* may be presented. To motivate the study, class discussions may be held pertaining to the best voices of radio and movie stars. Also, each child may be allowed to make a record of his own voice, then be shown exercises for developing correct speech habits.

To improve articulation, games may be played with tongue-twister exercises, and so determining which pupil can say the difficult phrase or sentence the most accurately.

By this time the child has likely developed an interest in improving his own conversational speech; therefore, the unit on *social conversation* may be given. Such exercises as mentioned earlier in the paper may teach rules of good conversation. Also in this unit the child may be encouraged to become familiar with many subjects for conversation. Special emphasis may be placed on those topics in which he is particularly interested—for example, current events, travel, outdoor activities, and heroes.

As an outgrowth of the study of conversation, pupils may be motivated to tell interesting stories and anecdotes. In connection with this unit, the class may select stories which they all like, with each person preparing one section for presentation. In addition, they may be taught to read entire poems and stories aloud to an audience, and thus develop the unit on *interpretation.*

The eighth-grade pupil's especial interest in current events may serve as motivation for the bulk of the second semester's course units: *discussion, parliamentary procedure,* and *public speaking.*

In the unit on discussion, the pupil may be taught not only to participate in a formal discussion, but also to act as leader of the group. This activity should be of definite help in training the child to become so imbued with his subject matter that he has not time to think of being afraid or self-conscious. Discussion may be conducted pertaining to current events, problems of school life, plans for a play-cast party, etc. Emphasis may be put on training the pupil to focus his ideas on the particular subject under discussion, and on encouraging the pupil to respect the opinion of others.

As an outgrowth of the unit, discussion, a study of parliamentary procedure might logically follow. The motive may be to teach the child how to preside at a meeting, and how to speak in an impromptu but effective manner.

In connection with this unit, dramatizations exemplifying correct rules of procedure may be presented. Also free-lance drills may be employed. (The class elects a chairman, then each member of the group may proceed to make any reasonable motions he wishes.)

The last unit, public speaking, may well comprise approximately twelve weeks of work, the major aims being to develop the pupil's self-confidence by teaching him to think logically, and to organize and present his material effectively before an audience. Again the pupil should be encouraged to use speech topics relating to his particular

interests (current events, adventure, travel, out-of-door activities, famous people, sports).

By the time a child reaches the ninth grade he is becoming more and more interested in the opposite sex; therefore, his speech training should include such activities as skits, dialogues, and plays.

In order to encourage the pupil's tastes and creative efforts, a brief time may be spent on play-selection. Class discussions may be held regarding movies and plays the junior-high-school pupil likes to patronize.

To develop initiative, poise, and ability to interpret life situations, the first unit may deal with *character portrayals,* in which he presents characterizations of well-known actors, and outstanding people in history and literature. He may also give skits and scenes from plays.

The third unit may be *group acting,* a division particularly designed to develop the pupil's speech skills and to aid him in making an adjustment to the opposite sex. This may be followed by units in the study of stagecraft and the actual presentation of one-act and full-length plays. During all of these activities one of the major aims may well be to develop the individual and to teach him how to adapt himself and to get along with people.

Thus it may be seen that a wide range of speech activities may be planned in order to meet the needs of the junior-high-school pupil.

In conclusion, let it be emphasized that the teacher must constantly keep in mind that she is not dealing with pupils who are oddities, but with individuals who are experiencing *normal* metamorphic reactions.

SPEECH NEEDS AND ABILITIES OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

VIRGIL A. ANDERSON
Stanford University

IN A SURVEY of forty-seven leading colleges, universities, and other teacher training institutions made four years ago it was found that approximately 40 per cent of them were inspecting the speech needs and abilities of prospective teachers.[1] This was accomplished either indirectly through a speech course or a speech test required of all entering students, or more directly by means of a special test given to all candidates for a teaching credential. Whether one considers this 40 per cent to be high or low depends to a certain extent upon the importance placed upon good speech in the teaching profession. Many will consider it to be distressingly low.

The testing program for prospective teachers at Stanford was begun in 1935. Between that time and 1942, the period covered by this study, 1200 students planning to become teachers were given individual performance tests in speech and the use of voice. Before the results of this program are discussed, it might be well to explain briefly the testing procedure.

I

The test consists of a simple performance in speaking and reading, the entire procedure requiring not more than three to five minutes for each student. The situation is made as simple and informal as possible. With the exception of speech and English majors and minors, no restrictions are placed upon the type of

[1] Virgil A. Anderson, "The College and University Speech Clinic: A Survey," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XVI (1940), 80-88.

activities: declamation, interpretative reading; dramatics; debate; discussion; extemporaneous speaking; oratory, or radio. A reasonable amount of skill in at least two of these.

III. *Academic Training*

A. Speech

1. At least a major in this field. This varies, depending upon the institution, from 20 to 40 semester hours. The total amount should:
   a. provide adequate preparation in subject matter;
   b. meet certification requirements. (These should be checked carefully by consulting publications,[1] or by writing directly to the state department of public instruction of the state whose requirements are desired);
   c. allow opportunity for taking work in minor and related fields necessary for certification and teaching.
2. Key course work for high school teachers:
   a. In *general speech positions* Voice and phonetics; Fundamentals of Speech; Debate and Discussion; Interpretation; Play Production, including organization, design, construction, lighting, and makeup; Directing; Dramatic Literature, Introductory Work in Acting; Speech Correction; Radio Production. These last three can be altered or amplified to fit the interests and needs of the prospective teacher. Courses in Playwriting, Radio Writing, and History of the Theatre would be useful, but not quite so vital to the high school teacher.
   b. In *speech correction* (not confined primarily to high school). Voice and Phonetics; Speech Pathology; Voice and Articulation Disorders; Stuttering; Organic Disorders; Lip Reading; Anatomy of Ear and Vocal Organs; Defective Hearing and Speech; Clinical Practice; and related courses in Psychology and Science. (*All* of the course work should be checked against specific state requirements for certification in special education[2] and with requirements of the American Speech Correction Association.[3]
3. Methods of Teaching Speech in the High School

   This should be a practical course organized around the problems which the teacher must meet in secondary schools.

   Suggested units: Brief Survey of the History of Speech Education; The Educational Philosophy of the Teacher of Speech; Adjusting the Speech Program to War Needs; Study of Psychology of Adolescent Boys and Girls; Facilities in the School for Speech Work; Relationship to the Administrator, Speech and Other Departments in the School; Community Relationships; Course Organization in Speech; Textbooks, Materials, and Equipment; Directing Extra-Class Activities; Teaching Problems in the Classroom: Psychological Bases for Teaching Speech; Getting Started in Class; Diagnoses of Speech Needs and Abilities; Handling Adjustment and Stage Fright; Teaching Preparation and Composition; Problems in Delivery; Criticism and Evaluation of Speech Performance.

B. Education (15-24 semester hours, depending upon the state requirements).

1. Introduction to Education, Psy-

[1] The following are two important such publications:

Robert C. Woellner and M. Aurilla Wood, *Requirements for Certification of Teachers and Administrators*, University of Chicago Press (1942-43). Published annually.

John Snidecor, *A Survey of Requirements for Certification of Secondary School Teachers of Speech*. Unpublished survey under auspices of the Secondary School Committee of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH (1940).

[2] Max D. Steer, *Certification and License Requirements for Speech Correction Teachers in Indiana* (Committee report to Indiana Speech Correction Teachers, June 29, 1940. Contains certain information on all states.)

[3] Martin F. Palmer, "American Speech Correction Association Membership Regulations," *Journal of Speech Disorders*, VIII (March, 1943) 41-51; also "The New Membership Requirements of the American Speech Correction Association," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXIX (April, 1943), 196-199.

chology, Measurements, General Technique of Teaching and Administration as required.

2. Methods (see #3 above). (3 semester hours required in all states.)
3. Laboratory or Practice Teaching (5-6 semester hours desirable; 3 hours required in all states).
   a. Observation of skilled teachers in action
   b. Planning and organizing units for instruction in cooperation with an experienced teacher
   c. Actual classroom teaching under supervision
   d. Experience in the direction of extra-class activities in speech from the following: declamation, interpretative reading, extemporaneous speaking, oratory, debate and discussion, dramatics, radio.
   e. Individual cases and small group work for speech correction teachers.
   f. The use and operation of recording equipment, mirrophone, public address and/or radio apparatus.

C. Related Fields (in many states two minors are required or a double major in one).

1. English (a minor is essential; a major is desirable especially for prospective dramatics and interpretation teachers.
   Beginning and Advanced Courses in Composition; Survey Courses in American and English Literature; Dramatic Literature; Contemporary Literature.
2. Social Studies (a minor is recommended; a major is desirable, especially for public speaking, debate, and discussion students).
   Economics; Economic Geography, Sociology, English and American History; Political Science; History of Special Periods, Movements, etc.

Such a program as this involves little change from that offered in most institutions. However, it does necessitate careful planning of the program of the individual teacher, and in some schools, the development of facilities to provide more practical experiences for teacher training.

NEW BOOKS

LOREN D. REID, *Editor*

The Growth of American Thought by Merle Curti. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943; pp. xx + 848. $5.00.

The Growth of American Thought is a "study of American intellectual life . . . organized in chronological periods according to ideas which may be thought of as characteristic of successive eras in that history." The thirty-seven chapters are divided into seven parts described by the following subtitles: "The American Adaptation of the European Heritage"; "The Growth of Americanism"; "Patrician Leadership"; "Democratic Upheaval"; "Triumph of Nationalism in Social and Political Thought"; "The Assertion of Individualism in a Corporate Age of Applied Science"; "Optimism Encounters Diversion, Criticism, and Contraction." The book is an account of the growth, on American soil, of knowledge and of speculation. It covers the period from the earliest settlements to the present day. In Professor Curti's own language, it is "primarily a social history of American thought."

The writing of a history of ideas that have taken root in American soil is a tremendous task. Professor Curti deserves the thanks of students and scholars everywhere for his courage in undertaking it, particularly in the absence of those special studies which would have lightened his labor. Although monographic material is available and was employed, as the helpful bibliographic note will testify, the resources for the study of certain phases of American popular thought must have perplexed Professor Curti more than once. So well has he succeeded in overcoming the obstacles that his book will be useful henceforth to all students of American history and indispensable to everyone interested in the background of American public address.

A review of the book might be concluded at this point; but since Professor Curti has expressed the hope that his book may furnish suggestions to others, it may be helpful to set down the following observations:

1. The influence of the classical tradition in American thought is not adequately represented. Transmitted though it was by other cultures, the impress of the Greek and the Roman upon the American intellect, especially upon that of the eighteenth century, deserves more systematic attention than Professor Curti has given to it. Remembering the respect in which some of the founding fathers held the ancients, I think it strange to find references to Fichte, Hegel, and Hobbes, but none to Quintilian; and I am astonished to discover mention of Ring Lardner, Scott Fitzgerald, and Jack London, but not even the name of Plato.

2. The commingling of the cultures at the borders is inadequately represented. Save for references in the early chapters, the Mexican influence in the Southwest and the Canadian influence in the Northeast seem to be obscured.

3. The mature if backward culture of the Appalachian and Ozark mountain people is neglected. Yet this culture persists to this day relatively untouched by the main stream of American thought.

4. After the early chapters, the influence of immigration on American thought is hardly considered. There is no satisfying account of the continuing process of receiving alien cultures within the body of the American tradition. Perhaps Hansen's *The Immigrant in American History* will serve as a corrective here.

5. All the foregoing considerations lend a specious unity to the interpretation of American thought. Professor Curti's task, to be sure, is the charting of the main stream; but the eddies, cross currents, and back waters must somehow be navigated also.

6. The American preoccupation with the getting, the holding, and the exploitation of the land is not placed in focus. Yet the folk-knowledge about and the folk-feeling for the land in a nation that has been largely rural calls for investigation and report.

7. Little is said about the sea and seafaring men; yet always some Americans have gone to sea. Their experiences are a part of American intellectual history. Morison's *Maritime History of Massachusetts* will sug-

gest a profitable line of inquiry in this direction.

8. Relevant principles employed in the selection of materials are not easily discernible. Though Ralph Adams Cram is recalled, for example, Howard Scott and technocracy are not. Although the book is concerned with popular thought, there is no mention of Jacob Coxey, Billy Sunday, or Edgar A. Guest, who certainly have held wide appeal for the masses. J. B. Rhine and extra-sensory perception are given a paragraph; but Alfred North Whitehead and Bertrand Russell apparently are ignored. Again, Karl Mannheim's influence is considered and Henri Bergson's is not. Yet some would have thought Mannheim's contribution to American intellectual life hardly more manifest than that of Bergson, whose creative evolution recently influenced some of the more enlightened elements of the American public. Edgar Lee Masters is noticed, but not Carl Sandburg; Ezra Pound, but not Vachel Lindsay. The only reference to G. B. Shaw seems curiously inadequate. It merely lists him, along with Oscar Wilde, Frank Harris, and George Moore, as one who taught that sex is not a mystery.

9. The readers of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH will be especially interested in the concept of speechmaking governing the book. It is gratifying to report that Professor Curti, in one revealing paragraph (page 440), discloses a mature conception of oratory as a social force. He does not confuse speechmaking with *belles lettres;* nevertheless, *The Growth of American Thought* does not even begin to represent speechmaking adequately as a characteristic element of American culture. Like most writers and nearly all modern American historians, Professor Curti is deceived by the supposedly more enduring quality of the written record; thus his book does not let us see the Americans engaged in that liveliest kind of thought—the face to face encounter of men and women engaged in earnest disputation. Perhaps no people who ever lived have discussed public and semipublic issues more fully than the antebellum Americans did; yet there is hardly a hint of it in Professor Curti's book. Nowhere is there a description to compare with Brigance's picture of Jeremiah Black before the United States Supreme Court (*History and Criticism of American Public Address,* I, 459); nowhere is there revealed such understanding of the functions of speechmaking in a democracy as Hudson and Howell unfold in their study of Daniel Webster (*Ibid.,* II, 665); nowhere is there presented such an analysis of the thinker-speaker as Wichelns discloses in his study of Emerson (*Ibid.,* II, 501). Perhaps students of American public addess must write their own histories. To such a conclusion Professor Curti would doubtless be the last to hold objection.

Despite current restrictions, the publisher has produced a substantial volume in pleasing format and attractive binding; the imperfections in proofreading and indexing are doubtless attributable to wartime stresses.

BOWER ALY,
University of Missouri

The 1943 Iowa Radio Audience Survey. Compiled by Forest L. Whan. Des Moines: published for the Central Broadcasting Company, 1943; pp. 90.

The Kansas Radio Audience of 1943. Compiled by Forest L. Whan. Copyright, 1943, by F. L. Whan; pp. 52.

Forest L. Whan's 1943 *Iowa Radio Audience Survey* and *The Kansas Radio Audience of 1943* provide the best pictures we have of listening habits of people in a single state. While these surveys will be of primary interest to broadcasters and time buyers, they still have significance for the teacher and listener who is interested in radio's social implications. They seek to be factual and not interpretative. They answer such questions as who listens, when, to what, for how long, etc. If the reader wants facts about radio listening, here are some of the answers. If he wants interpretations, he'll have to make his own.

To this reviewer, the most interesting data developed in the Kansas survey, for example, were those showing the increase in listening in 1943 over that of 1942. The author bases his evidence on replies to questionnaires and interviews gathered during a sample week in April and May, neither of these being months that would be likely to give favorable results to the industry.

Another interesting item was the number of farm families who listen from 12:00 to 12:30 P.M. This has always been a good time to reach a farm audience, but Whan's evidence indicated that in these two rural states it is particularly good. In fact, 53.4% of the

farmer set-owners who were surveyed used their radios during this period, as compared to 33.4% for those who live in villages and 28.1% for those who live in cities. The division between men and women listening at that time was almost even, apparently indicating that men as well as women listen during the noon hour.

His findings on program preference were not a surprise. The vast majority prefer news and commentators. Considering the importance of war news, this probably accounts for the increase in listening in 1943 over that of 1942 and, if a reviewer may hazard a guess, possibly means that listening in 1944 will increase over that of 1943. It probably means it will be a good year for advertisers and radio stations, with increasing difficulty experienced by educators in getting time. He further points out that Kaltenborn, Fulton Lewis, Jr., Elmer Davis, Walter Winchell, and Gabriel Heator were the favored five to Kansas listeners.

There are many other interesting and significant trends, if the reader wants to take the time to examine the data. The studies are well put-up, and attractively presented, but they are, as previously indicated, factual instead of interpretive. Professor Whan's methods are sound; his surveys have the benefit of years of experience and therefore permit those who are interested an opportunity to examine the change in listening habits from year to year.

Every one who is concerned with radio's social implications should have a copy of these surveys as a ready reference. Meantime, one might wish that Professor Whan could be persuaded to drop his pencil and statistical machine for a moment and, taking a brush, draw a bold and vigorous picture of radio listening based on the data, one that would give lazy people like this reviewer an opportunity to see the significance of the immense amount of evidence he has gathered. It's a factual piece of work that's well done and well presented. Now, let's get him to write it up in story form.

—KENNETH R. BARTLETT
Syracuse University

Henry W. Grady, Spokesman of the New South. By RAYMOND B. NIXON. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., pp. 360. $4.00.

At last comes an excellent biography on a man whose life never before has had adequate appraisal. In the half century since Grady's death the facts of his life "have become obscured by a haze of myth and legend." Schoolboys still declaim his description of the footsore Confederate soldier. The magazine *Fortune* recently joined the ranks of those who have quoted from his account of the funeral he attended in Pickens County. His so-called eloquence has lived, but only as words, whereas the man himself has faded into the haze of history.

In Professor Nixon's biography Grady the man takes shape and form. Speaking is shown to be only one of at least three sidelines to Grady's real profession of journalism; and if it is the one by which he is now remembered, this perhaps is proof (although the author does not say so) of the influence of public address on American life rather than a measure of emphasis given to it by Grady.

Four aspects of Grady's public life emerge from Professor Nixon's portrait, each of them clear and complete. First, is Grady the journalist with his keen sense of news, and his resourcefulness in scooping rivals. We see him, in reporting the Florida returns on the Hayes-Tilden election, discover ahead of his rivals that the telegraph lines had been cut, race five hours by buggy to the nearest line, hold priority on the wires by sending copy out of Webster's spelling book until he could finish writing the full story—and thus give his newspapers the story earlier than any others in the country. We see him, when three-fourths of Charleston was destroyed by an earthquake and transportation into the city was shut off, become the only newspaper man to reach the scene of disaster—going part way by horse, part by row boat, and the remainder in a privately chartered engine cab. We see him ghost writing for General Longstreet, interviewing Grant and Sherman—the latter of whom had been so careless with fire in Atlanta—and probing the economic problems of the South in penetrating articles. We can understand why at the age of 28, without benefit of a syndicate, he was correspondent for a string of newspapers in Chicago, New York, Detroit, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, and Louisville, as well as Atlanta. Before reaching the age of 30, he could say truthfully, "I have interviewed nearly every prominent man in the South and many of the greatest men in the North and West."

On the business side he was not at first so

uniformly successful, but after early publishing failures he became the "genius of the *Constitution*," under whose touch in twelve years the daily paper grew in circulation form 2,400 to 10,000 (15,000 on Sundays), and the weekly grew from 3,600 to an incredible 122,000—"largest of any newspaper of its kind in the United States"—and was sent "to every post office in Georgia and to every state and territory in the Union."

Second, Grady was not merely a man of words, either as writer or speaker, but was by nature essentially an organizer and promoter of civic, economic, and educational enterprises. His newspaper launched the First International Cotton Exposition of 1881, brought in a $2,000 gift toward it from General Sherman himself and 286,000 attendants to that city of less than 40,000, stimulated the industrialization of the South, and made a cash profit on the exposition proper. He launched a second exposition in 1887, and took active part in a third in 1889. He managed the city's first organized relief fund, promoted the building of a city Y.M.C.A. building and a new state capitol. He led the movement for founding the Georgia School of Technology and was partly responsible for selecting its first president. He promoted Atlanta's first professional baseball club and became first president of the Southern Baseball League. He organized the Piedmont Chautauqua that built a tabernacle seating 7,000, imported a summer faculty from the University of Virginia, and, against Bourbon opposition, brought in William McKinley to speak in favor of a protective tariff. He was, in short, a man of affairs.

Third, it was inevitable that when such a man was putting into action his definite ideas on industrializing the South he would be led into politics. He became the "Warwick of Georgia politics." Without organizing a political machine, nevertheless he put his men in office by publicity, speaking, conferences, and caucuses. It would seem that from 1873 until his death in 1889 not one man to whom he was opposed was elected as governor, senator, or as congressman from his district. Only on prohibition, which he supported, was he beaten.

Finally, his program for the economic regeneration of the South—as expressed in his own newspaper, his writings for other papers, his civic enterprises, and his selection of political candidates—led him inevitably, as "a statesman without office," to become its spokesman.

He had been trained in college as a speaker. He had had a fling on the professional lecture platform, and apparently had collected $500 for one lecture alone before he definitely renounced lecturing for journalism. He had never been able to escape speaking entirely, however, for always there were civic meetings, distinguished citizens to be greeted officially (Grover Cleveland and Jefferson Davis), political meetings, expositions, and Chautauquas (Grady drew a larger Chautauqua audience than McKinley). Yet he consistently refused outside invitations to speak.

But he was gravely concerned over the new flames of sectionalism that swept the North in 1886. Publicly he wrote about it and privately he talked about it with his friends in the North; and when the invitation came from the New England Society that year to speak at its 81st annual banquet, he conferred with his editorial staff, then accepted. The speech itself is history. Even the *Chicago Tribune*, disliking Grady and all he stood for, grudgingly conceded that it was "considered the speech of the year."

Professor Nixon supposedly is not a critic of public address. He is a journalist. But he has studied Marvin Bauer's critical evaluation of Grady's speaking (for which he tenders generous appreciation) and he knows the bases of critical appraisal. The reader is given the full setting of the New South address: the dining room, the number present, important personages, the program preceding Grady's appearance, and a very careful survey of the newspaper response. A full copy of the speech is offered, as reported by the *New York Tribune* and corrected by Grady for the proceedings of the New England Society. Described for us are Grady's voice, his posture, his refusal ever to use a manuscript. Exactly how Grady had prepared the speech is not told; it remains unknown, but circumstantial evidence is thrown on it by his conversation prior to the speech and by his method of preparing other speeches. For example, he delivered to his three associates on the *Constitution* the hour-long speech prepared for Dallas State Fair. When they approved it, he repeated the speech verbatim to a stenographer and had it set in type. Still again, he delivered it to the stenographer, "never missing a word," while the latter held the newspaper copy.

Then he went to Texas, stood before the crowd of 20,000 to 30,000 people, gave a speech "at least fifty per cent different," and had to telegraph the new version to the newspapers.

Other important speeches delivered during the remaining brief years of Grady's life are given adequate setting, especially his last speech, that in Boston on the "Race Problem in the South."

From this book there emerges a man who knew words as an instrument of power, and who spoke only at critical times and on issues over which he was gravely concerned. Probably no so-called "eloquent" American so consistently refused invitations to speak.

The author has shown discrimination in selection and balance, and he writes interestingly. No teacher of public address will want to pass this volume by.

W. NORWOOD BRIGANCE,
Wabash College

Experiments in Education. By LANE COOPER. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1943; pp. 176. $2.50.

This book is the last will and testament of its author. Like the wills of most men who have accumulated goods throughout an active life, goods which they wish to bequeath to their descendants, it is a miscellany—not of material, but of cultural goods. Of the fourteen chapters, the first three were originally given as addresses. They contain the "substance of doctrine" of the author. The first chapter, which carries the title of the book, makes it clear that "experiments" is ironical if taken as present-day experiments in education. All experiments have been made over and over again "in the more distant past, which is the greater part of history." Education in any period of history "never has been good, but always mostly bad"; both Socrates and Plato thought the education of their time was bad because it was Sophistical; but we, looking back to the teachings of Plato in his Academy, may find there "a healthy spot in a great desert." In other words, by isolating Plato's writings from the economic and political conflicts in Athenian society, we may study his distilled wisdom as an antidote for "the unmoral, unrighteous humanism of our time." In the same way we may study also the other historical "experiments" in education such as "the school of Christ and his disciples"; the system of Benedict in the schools of the Middle Ages, and the scheme of Quintilian, as well as "the educational experiences of the English-speaking race" against its background of Christian civilization. It is Professor Cooper's purpose throughout to administer a corrective for the badness of our education, and a rebuke to those who in our day chase after false gods of educational experimentation. He insists on his prerogative to combine the best of the pagan Hellenic culture with Christian tradition and doctrine.

The tone throughout the book is one of devotion to the artistic ordering of life, and this ordering of life must draw its inspiration and its teachings from the literatures of the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and English languages. The teachings of Plato, he says, have undergone a "conversion" into the Christian tradition. Wordsworth's "natural piety" he converts to "artistic piety."

It is a striking fact that he would have us study these materials in isolation from the historical times and processes in which their creators lived. Plato, we are told, never intended that the role he assigns to women in *The Republic* should be incorporated in any state. His view is the antithesis of that of Ernest Barker, who takes critical exception to Plato's denial of personality and of the affections of family life. For Plato's final word on family and divorce, Professor Cooper advises us to look to the *Laws*. He offers no explanation of the change in Plato's thought. Barker, on the other hand, suggests that Plato wrote *The Republic* in a mood of irritation at the lawlessness of the Athenian democracy, and thus gives us a clue to his mood and temper as artist and philosopher. Such clues to the understanding of the motives of great writers recommended by Professor Cooper are totally lacking in his book. By deliberately isolating the materials for study, he would have us ignore all relativities of historical criticism. Like his preceptor Plato, he seems to reject history for absolute values. Like King Canute, he would beat back the tides of change, which are at this moment sweeping us all into an unknown future.

Although many readers will find it impossible to accept this philosophy of education in our time, no student can read this book without profit. Wordsworth's criticisms of Walter Scott, as extracted from many sources, are a contribution to our apprecia-

tion of Wordsworth's capacity for friendship and for discriminating criticism.

Chapter VII, a course in general reading, is rich in suggestions of what to read and incitements to read. The candidly autobiographical chapters on courses in English, Greek, Dante, literary criticism, and scholarship contain suggestions of value to any teacher, whatever his philosophic view of cultural values. Of particular interest and value is the list of "The Writings of Lane Cooper" contained in the last 23 pages of the book.

FRANK M. RARIG,
University of Minnesota

Representative American Speeches: 1942-43. (The Reference Shelf, Vol. 16, No. 6.) Selected by A. CRAIG BAIRD. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1943: pp. 319. $1.25.

This, the sixth annual volume in a series edited by Professor Baird, is what in the nature of things it almost inevitably had to be—a volume of texts of speeches about the United States and the war. The speeches were unquestionably *American*, even though texts from Madame Chiang Kai-shek, Winston Churchill, Eduard Beneš, and Anthony Eden are included in the volume. They are *representative* of the major preoccupations of American speakers from mid-1942 to mid-1943, and of the chief media of American public adress.

The twenty-eight texts, representing speeches by twenty-four different persons, are arranged into eight groups: "Progress of the War" (Roosevelt and Churchill); "War Aims" (Carleton J. H. Hayes, Eduard Beneš, Denna Frank Fleming, Joseph C. Grew, and Mme. Chiang); "America and the Postwar World" (Wallace, Willkie, Lodge, Eden, and Frederick L. Shuman); "Inside Warring Europe" (Vandercook, Willkie, Lochner, and Frazer Hunt); "The Home Front" (James F. Byrnes and Lewis H. Brown); "The American Democratic Tradition" (Roosevelt and Edgar Eugene Robinson); "Education and the War (Robert M. Hutchins, Monroe E. Deutsch, and James Bryant Conant); and "Religion and the War" (Ralph W. Sockman, Wallace, Edgar De Witt Jones, and Fulton J. Sheen). There is an introduction of 4½ pages, supplementing Professor Baird's previous introductions in this series, concerned chiefly with the discussion of four propositions which must direct a reader in the appraisal of the speeches whose texts he will read: (1) "[The speech] should be placed in its general and specific setting." (2) "The speech should be weighed according to its ideas." (3) "The motives of the speaker should be considered." (4) "In addition to such essential factors as organization, language, and delivery, the immediate and ultimate effectiveness of the discourse should be gauged." (For analysis of Professor Baird's previous observations on speech criticism, the reader's attention is directed to Professor Wilbur E. Gilman's review of the fourth volume in the series, *QJS*, 28 [1942]: 249.)

A valuable headnote by Professor Baird precedes the text of each speech, and there is an appendix of biographical notes on the speakers. The volume is provided with a good analytical index and with a cumulative index of all speakers represented in the six volumes of the series to date.

Of the speaker in public life Professor Baird writes in his introduction: "The speaker comes by his personality partly because he moves in this social medium, and to an extent yields to it. He is both leader and follower. The sentiments and perplexities of the citizens become articulate through him. His orations, then, become an index of his time, a key to current attitudes and actions. To speechmaking, then, we turn, as an important source for understanding our contemporary life." So far as the major issue of America and the war goes, especially in its military and international phases, the speech making reported in the present volume fulfills well the function posited by Professor Baird. If the volume has any important limitation, however, that limitation is the failure to represent directly the speechmaking on the purely domestic issues: more specifically the great amount of opposition speaking exemplified by the anti-labor digressions in the news commentaries of Kaltenborn and the vituperative attacks upon the government by the spokesmen of the militant industrialists, such as the very popular luncheon speaker, Miss Vivian Kellams of Connecticut.

DONALD C. BRYANT,
Washington University

John Sharp Williams—Planter-Statesman of the Deep South. By GEORGE COLEMAN

OSBORN. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1943; pp. ix + 501. $4.00.

George Coleman Osborn, a native Mississippian and a frequent visitor at the home of John Sharp Williams, has presented a colorful and carefully documented biography of the man whom Woodrow Wilson looked upon as the last "planter-statesman." It is more than a recital of the activities of Williams; it is an interpretative account of his ancestry, education, philosophy, and public career—all against a carefully delineated backdrop of American history from the Civil War to 1923.

As if in response to the *New York Times'* hope that "John Sharp Williams' whims, his learning, his weaknesses, the touch of genius in him; his strong individualism and originality" would find "a competent, sympathetic but impartial biographer," Osborn has prepared a work of nineteen chapters together with a most useful "Critical Essay on Authorities." He has provided a vivid account of the personality, character, and activities of this Southern gentleman, planter, scholar, and statesman. He has explored Williams' principal interests in a wide range of subjects, Williams' education at Kentucky Military Institute, University of the South, University of Virginia, Heidelberg University, and the College of France at Dijon. He has not only reviewed Williams' career as a plantation manager and lawyer in Mississippi, and as a member of the House of Representatives from 1892-1911 and of the Senate from 1911 until his retirement in 1923, but has carefully interpreted Williams' affiliations, utterances, and actions in the light of his character and training.

To the student of American public address this volume should be of value in at least three respects. (1) It throws additional light upon the speechmaking of the period under consideration. For instance, it treats of the Jefferson and the Washington literary societies at the University of Virginia; and it reviews at least portions of several prominent debates in Congress on such issues as Free Silver, the tariff, the income tax, Imperialism, the League of Nations, and other post-war problems. (2) It provides material for not only a rhetorical study of Williams but also of studies of attendant persons and movements. (3) Through its "Critical Essay on Authorities" it directs one's attention to several manuscript collections, government documents, biographies, and special articles, as well as to newspapers and magazines. For instance, it sheds light upon the Williams Papers (in the Library of Congress), upon the three or four thousand manuscripts at the Williams home, and upon items in the Wilson Papers. It calls attention to the usefulness of certain Mississippi and Washington, D.C., newspapers and of a score of magazines, as well as of such works as *The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan*, Champ Clark's *My Quarter Century of American Politics*, and James E. Watson's *As I Knew Them*. In addition, it comments upon a score of biographies of contemporaries of Williams, more than fifty special articles pertaining to the period, and forty general and special histories.

In format, typography, and other mechanical details the volume is of high standard. Nine illustrations add to both the attractiveness and the usefulness of the biography.

KENNETH G. HANCE,
University of Michigan

English for Social Living. Edited by HOLLAND D. ROBERTS, WALTER V. KAULFERS, and GRAYSON N. KEFAUVER. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1943; pp. xiii + 366. $3.50.

In this book twenty-five teachers have described classroom practices in literature, speech, writing, radio, and the newspaper. The reports are introduced (Part I) by a statement of the point of view and basic principles developed as a part of the Stanford investigation to improve teaching in the language arts. Every contributor to *English for Social Living* is clearly familiar with and has accepted the philosophy that the areas considered are indivisible from all other areas in and out of school in the growth of young men and women for useful democratic citizenship.

Part II emphasizes developmental learning. In the four reports which compose this section the students and not the teachers originate and plan the program of study.

Part III attempts to show how a development of the whole individual can be brought about through a development of language if learning is in a cooperative social setting rather than in the confines of narrow subject matter fields.

Part IV is a stimulating consideration of

English functioning in the daily life of students in widely differing communities.

Part V has nine contributors. Together they attempt to satisfy parents and teachers of English and speech who need assurance that modern trends in education have not ignored the need for skill in the techniques of reading, writing, speaking and listening.

Part VI is devoted to semantics. It recognizes the growing interest in the study of word meanings in developing critical thinking and in understanding the intellectual and emotional responses of students.

The book is both thought-provoking and persuasive. It is the belief of this reviewer that it will do much to stimulate and improve teaching techniques in high school and college. Part V is less helpful to the speech teacher than it might have been if it had included more suggestions for the improvement of voice and action in oral communication. Such recognition might have strengthened the general point of view of the book, and at the same time refuted the accusation that students are merely practicing speech rather than perfecting it.

It is clear that the book has been carefully prepared in spite of several unfortunate typographical errors. It is well adapted for use as a text in certain courses in pedagogy. All teachers of speech methods should be conversant with this point of view and many will wish to make the book required reading for their students.

GLADYS BORCHERS,
University of Wisconsin

American War and Peace Aims: The Seventeenth Annual Debate Handbook. Edited by Bower Aly for the Committee on Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation of the National University Extension Association. Columbia, Mo.: Lucas Brothers, 1943; 220 pp. $1.00.

This handbook is one of the important services of the Committee on Debate Materials to the high school debaters of the country. Other services include the selection of the topic for the year, its wording into a proposition for debate by a group of experts, and the annual radio debate. The proposition based on American War and Peace Aims is worded "Resolved: That the United States should join in reconstituting the League of Nations." The purpose of this annual publication is to help high school students prepare to debate this proposition or discuss this topic. To this end each year the handbook endeavors to supply (1) information on sources of material, (2) an introductory analysis of the proposition, and (3) some arguments and evidence on both sides by established authorities.

This year the handbook follows its usual form. For sources it lists with addresses organizations which furnish material on the topic free or at little expense; it tells about the transcripts of the radio debate; it gives the details of the Cooperative Purchase Plan through which schools may purchase groups of books and pamphlets from the Committee at reduced prices; and it has a short bibliography of recent books, pamphlets and articles in periodicals on the topic. The analysis by the editor gives many helpful suggestions for sound thinking. The arguments and evidence may be found in the reprints of articles and speeches which make up the larger part of the book. There are also a few original contributions. Authorities quoted include Roosevelt, Churchill, and Wilson, as well as Quincy Wright, George Renner, Senator Taft, and Norman Thomas.

If the handbook does not follow its usual form with its usual success, its weaknesses may be laid to the decisions of the committee rather than to the editor. Since the topic chosen is so much like that of last year, instead of the usual two volumes, only one is published. For additional readings and all but the very latest references, students are referred to the volumes of last year. Using the League as the focus for the proposition makes it difficult to get up-to-date material bearing directly on the issues of the proposition, so many of the reprints are on the general topic. Although he defines the terms of the proposition well, the editor wanders far afield from the proposition in his analysis.

Yet here are the tools with which the high school student may uncover much information on our possibilities for post-war policy, shape his own ideas, build his own case on whatever proposition he chooses, and dig out the arguments and evidence to defend his point of view. The rest is up to him. And that is the way it should be.

BROOKS QUIMBY
Bates College

The Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature. Edited by HORATIO

SMITH. Announced for fall publication by the Columbia University Press.

The Columbia University Press announces for fall publication a project that has been under way for some time, and which will be of interest to teachers of speech, particularly in the fields of interpretation and dramatics. This volume, *The Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature*, according to the publisher's announcement, "will present the first complete record of recent and contemporary literature in all the countries of the European continent." It will contain about 1,000 articles written by more than 200 scholars, treating some 30 different literatures.

Professor Horatio Smith, executive officer of the French department at Columbia University and editor of *The Romanic Review*, is the general editor of the volume.

Outlines of Research in General Speech. By HOWARD GILKINSON. Minneapolis; Burgess Publishing Co., 1943; pp. ii + 80. $1.75.

There is much that we do not know about speech, and much that we must still state tentatively, but little by little researchers in our field are trying to arrive at accurate answers concerning many hypotheses and theories.

This book presents a collection of many experimental researches in speech, arranged in patterns of logical and critical interpretation.

The first 41 pages are devoted to drawing the widely scattered studies together and organizing them around salient issues and topics. The studies and their significant findings are classified under three major headings: (1) "Correlates of Speech Skill"; (2) "Speaker-Audience Research"; and (3) "Effects of Speech Training." Each major section is divided into 10 to 14 sub-sections in which are presented brief summaries of pertinent research. These sub-sections include such topics as "Speech Skill and Intelligence," "Speech and Personality," "Social Fears," "Studies in Rhetoric," "Case Histories," and 27 other important topics. Each major section concludes with a one- or two-page statement of "General Trends and Conclusions."

The latter half of the book gives an excellent bibliography of 354 entries of studies and texts relating to general speech.

The mimeographing job is decidedly superior.

This very excellent piece of work is part of the answer to some of the much-needed objective research in speech. It is a competent handling of many efforts into a pattern of organized wholes. The author states: "It is hoped that the outlines and bibliography will prove useful to teachers who wish to familiarize themselves with research in the field of general speech, to students who are required to know it, and to persons who plan to conduct investigations in these and related areas. A field of scholarship develops to a considerable extent as a continuum of effort along lines defined by previous investigations (and speculation), and an advanced student who begins his research without a thorough background is very seriously handicapped. The material has been prepared with his needs especially in mind."

This reviewer would go further than Professor Gilkinson, and suggest that the *Outlines* should be in the hands of every graduate student; and that teachers, especially those who have been long in the field of speech or who have entered by way of English training, and who are unfamiliar with recent pertinent experimental research, should read this material.

This is a valuable contribution to the field of speech education: a contribution which this reviewer believes will occupy a significant place in future research and future teaching.

CLYDE W. DOW,
Massachusetts State College

University Debaters' Annual. Edited by EDITH M. PHELPS. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1943; pp. 368. $2.25.

In spite of the draft and transportation problems, 1942-1943 debate schedules were pretty well maintained. Most forensic directors realize that freedom of discussion is a privilege that no student generation must be denied. Likewise, the publishers of the *Annual*, in spite of the fact that they were limited to war and post-war subjects, have recorded much of the best that student debaters have said in the last season.

As might be expected, the level of performance is not quite so high as usual, but certain debates and certain individual speeches are as fine as any that have been published. The most profound and at the same time the most interesting work in the volume, as far as the reviewer is concerned, is

the debate-discussion on the Burton-Ball-Hatch-Hill Resolution. Amusing, interesting and instructive is the debate-panel discussion on "War Marriages," which is weakened only because the rebuttal time is too short. Except for the quibbling over statistics, the debate on "A Universal Draft of Man and Woman Power" is probably the finest example of close reasoning and good adapting in the volume. The radio debate on "A Russian-United States Alliance" is fairly good, but lacking in a clear-cut clash. It would have been better if all the speakers had taken greater care in stating arguments to be established or refuted.

The symposium on "The Value of the College Woman to Society" is clever in spots but some of the speakers were not well enough prepared to keep from being verbose. The feature of the debate on "A Permanent Federal Union" is the questioning following each speech, a device that forces speakers to qualify any wild statements they may have made earlier. The recorded debate on "A Federal World Government" is not up to the usual University of Southern California-University of Redlands standard. Analogy is worked to death and the time-keeper seemed to be rather too generous.

Probably the weakest effort in the volume is the old-style, three-man-team debate on "A Planned Economy for the United States After the War." However, the *Annual* as a whole is very much worthwhile, and the reviewer asks but one question: How much editing do the debates receive? Some are as smooth as essays, and some read like talk. Let them all read like talk!

UPTON PALMER, *Santa Ana Air Base*

World Peace Plans. By JULIA E. JOHNSEN, comp. New York, The H. W. Wilson Company, 1943; pp. ii + 281. $1.25.

If the war should end tomorrow, what terms would *you* consider the minimum essentials for postwar peace and security? In case Britain, Russia, or China should object to your terms, how much are *you* willing to compromise? It is important that the citizens of this and every other country give careful consideration to these two questions. For, as Julia Johnsen writes: "Behind those who will labor over the difficult problems of peace, the moral force of the average man and his determination to help the plan work along lines of the highest principles will be the greatest promise for an enduring world order."

Today individuals, groups, and government agencies by the score are working on peace plans. Frequently the planners give their chief emphasis to some particular aspect of the problem: economic, political, or military. One group recommends a regional grouping of nations, another calls for a world government. We read these plans and feel that each has merit. However, because they are not brought together in a single volume, we find it difficult to compare, contrast, and evaluate.

Miss Johnsen has made a valuable contribution by assembling the major peace plans now before the public. Among them are "Foundations of Peace," by Hoover and Gibson; "A Proposal for a Definite United Nations Government," by Stassen; "Council of Europe and a Council of Asia," by Churchill; "World Federation Plan," by Culbertson; "Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program," by Hull; "United States Federal Union as a Model for World Organization," by Streit; and many others. Over and above these are excerpts from leading writers on such factors as an international police force, economic unions, freedom of the air, regionalism, and sovereignty.

The last section of the book takes up "Some Pros and Cons." These are followed by a list of seventy organizations now engaged in research on post-war problems. The final 32 pages give an up-to-date bibliography.

The function of a compiler is to assemble the material as it comes from the hands of the writer with no attempt at evaluation. In this regard Miss Johnsen has made a worthwhile contribution. The chief stress is on political proposals for an international order with the greater emphasis on constructive rather than destructive material.

This book should appeal to the average layman who wishes to gain a more comprehensive view of this vast subject. It should also prove helpful as supplementary reading to those studying this year's debate proposition.

FLOYD W. LAMBERTSON,
Iowa State Teachers College

A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English. By JOHN S. KENYON and THOMAS A. KNOTT. Springfield: G. and C. Merriam Company, 1944; pp. lii + 484. $3.00.

This country has long needed a work comparable to Jones' *An English Pronouncing Dictionary*, but one not restricted, as Jones' is, to a single variety of English. The present work covers the three main varieties of English in America: the Eastern, Southern, and what the authors call "Northern." The last term is perhaps unfortunate; the term "General American," previously used by Kenyon, seems open to fewer objections. By "Eastern" the authors refer to the speech east of the Connecticut River, and also to the speech of New York City and its environs. The inclusion of New York City in the eastern area is dubious; in many important respects its speech is more like that of the South than that of eastern New England.

The book includes several types of words: those in common use; those with variations in pronunciation; and those less common words, chiefly of literary, scientific, or geographical significance, which the student is likely to encounter in his reading. The authors then record the colloquial pronunciations, that is, the pronunciations of well-bred ease, of these words, and make some attempt to show which pronunciations are used more widely than others, and in which sections of the country. More widely used pronunciations are listed before those less widely used, and regional preferences are indicated by abbreviations. For example, such an entry as *long* [lɔŋ, lɒŋ]; S + [lɑŋ] indicates that [lɔŋ] is somewhat more widespread than [lɒŋ], and that the South uses the third pronunciation [lɑŋ] as well. This inclusiveness is probably the book's strongest point; critics will have difficulty finding good pronunciations which have been omitted. And, though the authors place slight emphasis on this point, the relative frequency of the different pronunciations has been indicated with considerable accuracy. Thus, the most frequent pronunciation for *log* is shown as [lɔg]; for *hog*, [hɑg]; for *torrent*, ['tɔrənt]. Though such facts as these have been known to phoneticians for years, they have not yet found their way into the general dictionaries, not even the most recent.

No first edition of such a book can hope to be definitive; additional investigation, in preparation for subsequent editions, may show that a few changes are desirable. Thus, for *garage*, the authors give [gə'rɑʒ] first, [gə'rɑdʒ] second. My own data indicate that the latter pronunciation is always used by at least 65 per cent of the population (in Pennsylvania), and that it may be used by as much as 74 per cent (west of the Mississippi). The preference for [ɔ] in *horrid, forest, torrent*, and similar words, though doubtless true for the country as a whole, is certainly not true for the East or the South or for the Atlantic coastal area connecting them, where [ɑ] is the predominant vowel. The preference for [ju] over [u] in *duty, new, tune*, and similar words is almost certainly not found anywhere outside the South. Nor is the use of [ɒ] for [ɑ] in words like *hot, stop*, and *lock* probably as common in the South as some of the notes at the top of individual pages suggest. These, however, are minor faults. In scope, planning, execution, and point of view the book is admirable.

C. K. THOMAS,
Cornell University

Phonetics: A Critical Analysis of Phonetic Theory and a Technic for the Practical Description of Sounds. By KENNETH L. PIKE. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1943; pp. ix + 182. $2.50

Phonetics is perhaps unfortunate in having to serve as title for this esoteric monograph, neither in fact nor in explicit intent a treatise on phonetics as we have known her or as Pike reidentifies her. The second part of the subtitle might well do as full title. While one cannot expect to find here anything like general coverage of the field, he can find the very valuable suggestion that there are possibilities in the production of speech and nonspeech sounds not covered in the casual manuals, and a fair array of guide posts pointing the directions in which one ought to search when looking for the less obvious features, especially in recording new languages.

A reader bent on discovering what Pike has to offer may advantageously confine his reading to Part II, checking occasional cross references to constructive paragraphs in Part I. (Most of Part I is on the pattern of the introductory whine of doctoral dissertations, pointing out that previous writers, scholars, and hacks spotted in 347 footnotes, had failed to see the light or had seen it but dimly.) The piling up of jargon, new technical terms and redefinitions of old ones, is rather appalling, but need not be taken too

seriously. One or two terms may have permanent value, such as *velic* for articulation of the velum with the pharyngeal wall, leaving *velar* for the back-of-tongue articulation. There are a few careless details, as in the use of wrong phonetic symbols and the use of the same analphabetic symbol for two meanings under the same head. Principally it must be noted that, where he is not engaged in pure systematization, Pike relies almost wholly on self-observation; diligent and painstaking, yet leaving much to be desired in objective demonstration. At one point he is stumped: "When an articulation whistles, it whistles," and that's all there is to it. There is a great deal with which other phoneticians may disagree.

The summation of the work is in the plan of "Functional Analphabetic Symbolism" with 160 letter symbols. The mass of detail in such a scheme is splendid as indicating the complexity of what we are dealing with, the necessity of checking up on many possibilities. Unfortunately the table of symbols is badly organized, offering formulas unnecessarily cumbersome and not necessarily consistent. Thus the table demands "MaIlDe" to mean "produced by egressive lung air," for which "Le" would do as well; under the rubric "degrees of articulation" are five undifferentiated groups of symbols of three different orders; "strength of acoustic impression" is put in the articulation group, although Pike elsewhere carefully separates loudness from articulation. (The reviewer has rearranged the table for about 120 symbols, offering formulas less than half as long as those shown.) Use of the scheme is illustrated by formulas for seven sound segments, employing 30 to 88 symbols each. That for [n] is: "*M*aIlDe*C*VoeIpvnn*A*P*paatdtlt*n*ransnsfS*pvavdtlvt*n*ransssf*T*pgagdtlwv*t*itv*r*ansnsf-S*rpFSs*," of which "T*pgagdtlwvtitvransnsf*" means that the vocal cords are in normal vibration with "wide" (?) degree of articulation and "cavity friction" (which Pike elsewhere notes as audible only when sounds are voiceless and which does not obviously agree with the first "v" in the formula, "nonfrictional"); there is no notation of pitch as provided for in the table.

An excellent idea, full of stimulating suggestion; an impressive labor, wanting much sober revision.

LEE S. HULTZÉN

THE FORUM

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee recommends for approval in December, 1944, the following list of candidates:

President: JOSEPH F. SMITH, *University of Utah*

First Vice-President: W. NORWOOD BRIGANCE, *Wabash College*

Second Vice-President, WILLADELL ALLEN, *Maine Township High School, Park Ridge, Illinois*

Members of the Executive Council:

MAGDALENE KRAMER, *Teachers College, Columbia University*

P. MERVILLE LARSON, *Southwest Texas State Teachers College*

RUTH THOMAS, *Public Schools, Passaic, New Jersey*

ANDREW T. WEAVER, *University of Wisconsin*

Submitted by:

BOWER ALY
GILES W. GRAY
JAMES H. MCBURNEY
W. HAYES YEAGER
CLAUDE M. WISE, *Chairman*

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE N.A.T.S.

Hotel Commodore, New York City
Monday, December 27, 1943, 1:45 P.M.

Meeting called to order by President West.

Vice-President Aly reported on the program, calling attention to highlights.

The report of the Executive Secretary was presented and placed on file.

Wagner reported as Research Editor. Report accepted.

Aly moved: The Executive Council approves drawing upon the Reserve Fund for printing costs in excess of $600.00 if necessary to make it possible for the Research Editor to publish 128 pages in the 2-column format as Vol. XI of Speech Monographs in 1944. Wagner seconded. Carried.

Editor Brigance reported on the JOURNAL. Report accepted.

Crocker reported for the Sub-Committee on Extracurricular Activities. A series of recommendations was presented by Committee member Ralph Schmidt.

Aly moved that the report be received and referred to a committee consisting of McBurney, Chairman, Green and McGurk for further consideration and recommendations back to the Council. Seconded. Carried.

Cortright moved for this specific conference to extend a special 75¢ conference-registration fee to both authenticated graduate and undergraduate students who have not and are not now holding remunerative teaching positions. Seconded. Carried.

Aly reported for the Committee on Studies in the History of American Public Address. The Chairman recommended by way of organization an executive committee made up of one representative from

each of the major areas of the country plus the Editor of RESEARCH MONOGRAPHS and the Committee's Chairman as ex officio members; and an advisory council to give representation to interested research agencies (graduate schools, libraries, historical societies, etc.).

It was moved by Gray to approve the above-mentioned items of Aly's report. Wallace seconded. McBurney moved to amend by including two persons from each of the major areas for membership on the executive committee. Yeager seconded. Amendment adopted. McBurney moved to add: "The Executive Committee shall be constituted as the policy-determining body." Seconded. Amendment adopted. Motion carried as amended.

Wise reported for the special QUARTERLY JOURNAL Editor-nominating committee (Wise, Wallace, Hance), recommending that, in this emergency, provision be made for the re-election of Brigance if he would consent; otherwise that Karl R. Wallace be the new Editor. The report was accepted. Brigance asked that re-election not be considered. Cortright moved the election of Karl Wallace as JOURNAL Editor for the three-year term beginning January 1, 1945. McBurney seconded. Carried.

Wallace reported for the War Committee, stressing the need for a full-time Executive Secretary located in Washington, D.C. The report was received; and, after lengthy discussion, further consideration was postponed to a later meeting.

Gray moved that the Executive Council appoint a Committee to consider the possibility, advisability and feasibility of developing a series of studies in the history of speech pedagogy, the Commttee to report at the 1944 Conference. Seconded and carried.

It was moved that the Committee on Committees be delegated to bring in the usual Committee nominations. Seconded and carried.

Moved to adjourn until 7:30 Wednesday evening, December 29, 1943. Seconded and carried.

Wednesday, December 29, 1943.
7:45 P.M.

Meeting called to order by President West.

There was discussion of the problem of what action to take regarding A.S.T.P. directives concerning Speech. Action was left for later discussion.

Wagner reported for the Research Committee recommending: That projects involving research which are submitted to the Executive Council for sponsorship by the N.A.T.S. should be referred to the Committee on Research for advisory counsel as to their worthiness. Seconded by Wallace. Carried.

Cortright read the report of Hance for the Committee on Publications. The report called attention to problems arising from the premature publication of The Elementary School Report and presented the following recommendations concerning *Speech Abstracts* (whose present editor and publisher has suggested its being taken over by the N.A.T.S.):

1. That Professor Dow be commended upon his work and be encouraged to continue until the N.A.T.S. can take over.

2. That the Committee on Research be asked to continue study of the problem.

3. That the final disposition of the problem be postponed until the war is over. The report was received and placed on file. Cortright moved: Be it resolved that the Executive Council of the N.A.T.S. regards with grave concern the premature publication of the Elementary School Committee report by the Expression Company and charges the Committee on Publications with seeing that the Expression Company's promise to recall and replace defective copies be fully car-

ried out; and that we further recommend to the Publications Committee publication in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL of an announcement inviting recipients of copies of the original volume of the Elementary School Committee's report to return said copies to the Expression Company for replacement, as per its agreement, by satisfactorily corrected copies. Wagner seconded. Carried. Wallace moved to refer the recommendations concerning *Speech Abstracts* to the Committee on Research for further study. Green seconded. Carried.

Knower's report for the Committee on Problems in Speech Education was read. Received and placed on file with commendation of Knower.

Robinson's report for the Subcommittee on the Secondary Schools was read—received and placed on file with appreciation and with particular commendation for the Committee's assistance to the Editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL, and for the issuance of the reprints of Secondary School articles.

Rasmussen's report for the Subcommittee on the Elementary Schools was read, and placed on file. The Committee announced the publications of its report: *Guides to Speech Training in the Elementary School* by The Expression Co. Kroggel's report for the Subcommittee on Junior Colleges was received and placed on file. Rahskopf's report for the Subcommittee on Colleges and Universities was received and placed on file. Kramer's report for the Subcommittee on Teacher Education was received and placed on file. The report for Morris for the Subcommittee on the National Education Association was received with thanks and placed on file. Aly's report for the Subcommittee on the N.U.E.A. was received and placed on file.

Thonssen reported for the Committee on Bibliography—raising the question of the cost of printing the results of its work. After some discussion, Cortright moved that the report be received and the Committee instructed to proceed as its judgment dictates. Seconded and carried.

The Council considered the emergency problem reported earlier by the War Committee and its recommendation that the Association have more adequate representation in Washington. Favoring the recommendations of the War Committee and desiring to further them, Cortright tendered his resignation as Executive Secretary, thus giving the Council a clear field in which to reorganize the secretariat to meet the emergency described by the War Committee. McBurney moved that this resignation be accepted regretfully and with thanks. Seconded. Carried. Gray moved, Wallace seconded, that Yeager be named Executive Secretary, for the unexpired term, beginning immediately. Carried.

McBurney moved, Green seconded, that the Chair appoint a Committee to consider and recommend a budget for the Executive Secretary. Carried. (The Chair appointed Aly, Chairman, Wise, and Cortright to meet with Yeager.) McBurney moved that the Executive Secretary be instructed to delegate his duties as Business Manager and Treasurer for the present term of office to Rupert L. Cortright. Seconded. Carried.

Brigance moved that the President for 1944 appoint a committee to revise the Constitution. Seconded. Carried.

Brigance moved adjournment until 1:00 P.M. Thursday. Seconded and carried.

Thursday, December 30, 1943, 1:00 P.M.

Meeting called to order by President West.

Aly reported for the special committee presenting a recommended budget for the Executive Secretary as follows:

A total of $1,500; $500 of which to go to Yeager for his part-time services; and $1,000

to cover necessary expenses for Yeager and his assisting Committee on Educational Policy.

Aly moved adoption of this budget. Gray seconded. Carried.

Aly moved adoption of the following as a definition of the duties of the Executive Secretary:

1. The Executive Secretary is not to commit but rather to recommend to The National Association of Teachers of Speech.
2. He is to formulate policies on the basis of official, semiofficial, and unofficial sources.
3. He is to keep himself constantly informed of decisions, directives, and policies affecting the N.A.T.S. and to inform Sustaining Members.
4. He is to study the structure of the Association with a view to making any adaptations necessary to meet changing conditions.
5. He is to look forward to the establishment of a secretariat in Washington.

Seconded and adopted.

In order to finance the budget for the Executive Secretary it was moved that the Association set up a class of memberships called Contributing Memberships at $20.00 per year—the Contributing Member to receive all of the advantages of a Sustaining Member. Seconded and carried.

Wagner moved: The Executive Secretary, consulting with the President and Business Manager shall set up a Committee on Educational Policy to assist him—the Executive Secretary to be Chairman of this Committee. Seconded and carried. Brigance moved that the Business Manager be instructed to arrange for the 1944 Conference in Chicago if possible, or in St. Louis, Detroit, or Cleveland. Seconded and carried.

It was moved to hold in abeyance any decision as to meeting place in 1945. Seconded and carried.

Reports were heard from the Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion Activities, the Committee on Contemporary Public Address, the Committee on Exchange of Materials, and the Committee to Secure Sound Pictures of Speakers in Action. Reports placed on file.

The report and recommendations of the Committee on Committees were approved as presented and the President was empowered to make any remaining appointments necessary. (Since a complete list of Association Committees is printed following these minutes the complete personnel is not listed here.) The meeting adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE GENERAL SESSION OF THE N.A.T.S.

Grand Ballroom, The Commodore, New York City
Tuesday, December 28, 1943

Meeting called to order by President West.

Ballots were cast for the Nominating Committee for 1945 officers. The following tellers were appointed: George Bohman, Chairman, Edmund Cortez, Mary Huber, Everett Schreck, Almere Scott.

Brigance presented the report of the Editor of the JOURNAL. The President announced the action of the Council in naming Karl R. Wallace as Editor-Elect of the JOURNAL to take office in January, 1945.

Brigance reported for the Nominating Committee of The N.A.T.S. for 1943, read the Committee's report as previously printed in the April JOURNAL, and moved that the following nominees be elected:

President: Bower Aly, University of Missouri
First Vice-President: Joseph F. Smith, University of Utah
Second Vice-President: John W. Black, Kenyon College
Members of the Executive Council:
Dina R. Evans, Heights High School, Cleveland Heights, Ohio

Kenneth G. Hance, University of Michigan
Gerald E. Marsh, University of California
Loren D. Reid, Syracuse University

Motion adopted unanimously.
Meeting adjourned.

Thursday, December 30, 1943

Meeting called to order by President West.

Greetings were read from E. P. and T. C. Trueblood.

The tellers report was announced: The Nominating Committee for 1945 officers consists of C. M. Wise, Chairman, Bower Aly, Giles Gray, J. H. McBurney, and W. Hayes Yeager.

The President announced the action of the Council in naming W. Hayes Yeager as Executive Secretary and reappointing Rupert Cortright to continue in his actual present position as Business Manager and Treasurer.

President West presented the Gavel to incoming President Aly. Meeting adjourned.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH

Standing Committees

The Chairman of each Committee is named first. Ex-officio members are listed in italics.

Committee on Research

Russell H. Wagner, Cornell University
Bower Aly, University of Missouri
Virgil A. Anderson, Stanford University
James F. Bender, Queens College
Wilbur S. Howell, Princeton University
Claude E. Kantner, Louisiana State University
Franklin H. Knower, State University of Iowa
James H. McBurney, Northwestern University

Committee on Finance

Henry L. Ewbank, 1 yr., University of Wisconsin
G. E. Densmore, 2 yr., University of Michigan
Clarence Simon, 3 yr., Northwestern University
Rupert L. Cortright, Wayne University
W. Hayes Yeager, George Washington University

Committee on Publications

Kenneth G. Hance, University of Michigan
Marie Hochmuth, University of Illinois
Andrew T. Weaver, University of Wisconsin
W. Norwood Brigance, Wabash College
Rupert L. Cortright, Wayne University
Russell H. Wagner, Cornell University
Bower Aly, University of Missouri
Karl R. Wallace, University of Virginia
W. Hayes Yeager, George Washington University

Steering Committee

Robert W. West, University of Wisconsin
Bower Aly, University of Missouri
Herbert A. Wichelns, Cornell University
Claude M. Wise, Louisiana State University
W. Hayes Yeager, George Washington University

Committee on Problems in Speech Education

Franklin H. Knower, State University of Iowa
Horace G. Rahskopf, University of Washington
Wesley Wiksell, Stephens College
Magdalene Kramer, Teachers College, Columbia University
Carrie Rasmussen, Longfellow School, Madison, Wis.
Karl F. Robinson, State University of Iowa

Subcommittee on the Secondary Schools

Karl F. Robinson, State University of Iowa
Gladys Borchers, University of Wisconsin
Evelyn Konigsberg, Richmond Hill H.S., N.Y.C.
Cyretta Morford, Redford H.S., Detroit, Mich.
Katherine A. Ommanney, North Denver H.S., Denver, Colo.

Subcommittee on the Elementary Schools

Carrie Rasmussen, Longfellow School, Madison, Wis.
Rita Criste, Public Schools, Evanston, Ill.
Elvena Miller, Public Schools, Seattle, Wash.
Merel Parks, Public Schools, Detroit, Mich.
Letitia Raubicheck, Public Schools, N.Y.C.

Subcommittee on Junior Colleges

Wesley Wiksell, Stephens College
Other members yet to be named.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Horace G. Rahskopf, University of Washington
George V. Bohman, Dartmouth College
Howard Gilkinson, University of Minnesota
Karl Wallace, University of Virginia
W. Hayes Yeager, George Washington University

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

Magdalene Kramer, Teachers College, Columbia University
Mabel Allen, Illinois State Normal University
G. E. Densmore, University of Michigan
Ernest H. Henrikson, University of Denver
D. W. Morris, State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Ind.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Lionel Crocker, Denison University
Paul Briggs, Bay City H.S., Bay City, Mich.
Karl F. Robinson, State University of Iowa
Ralph N. Schmidt, Lafayette College
Almere Scott, University of Wisconsin

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Bower Aly, University of Missouri
John W. Black, Kenyon College
W. Norwood Brigance, Wabash College
Rupert L. Cortright, Wayne University
Giles W. Gray, Louisiana State University
Clarence T. Simon, Northwestern University
Joseph Smith, University of Utah
Russell H. Wagner, Cornell University
Karl R. Wallace, University of Virginia
Robert W. West, University of Wisconsin
W. Hayes Yeager, George Washington University

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

COMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE AND DISCUSSION ACTIVITIES

Wilfred P. Rayner, Junior College, Jackson, Michigan
George Beauchamp, Washington, D.C.
W. A. Black, Junior College, Pueblo, Colorado
Lionel G. Crocker, Denison University
Hugo Hellman, Marquette University
Charles R. Layton, Muskingum College
N. Edd Miller, University of Texas
Wilbur E. Moore, Central Michigan College of Education
Forrest H. Rose, S.E. Missouri Teachers College

COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL STUDIES IN AMERICAN ORATORY

Bower Aly, University of Missouri
W. Norwood Brigance, Wabash College
Dallas Dickey, Louisiana State University
Loren D. Reid, Syracuse University
Russell H. Wagner, Cornell University

COMMITTEE ON CONTEMPORARY PUBLIC ADDRESS

Ota Thomas Reynolds, Hunter College
(Other members of the Committee to be appointed by the President)

COMMITTEE ON ENCOURAGEMENT OF SCHOLARSHIP

Giles Wilkeson Gray, Louisiana State University
Wilbur E. Gilman, University of Missouri
Ota Thomas Reynolds, Hunter College
Lester Thonssen, College of the City of New York
Russell H. Wagner, Cornell University

COMMITTEE TO SECURE SOUND PICTURES OF SPEAKERS IN ACTION

Richard Woellhaf, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
Lionel Crocker, Denison University
Earl E. Fleischman, College of the City of New York
Ray K. Immel, University of Southern California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

W. Hayes Yeager, George Washington University
Bower Aly, University of Missouri
Gladys Borchers, University of Wisconsin
W. Norwood Brigance, Wabash College
Rupert L. Cortright, Wayne University
G. E. Densmore, University of Michigan
Ray Ehrensberger, University of Maryland
Magdalene Kramer, Teachers College, Columbia University
Monroe Lippman, Tulane University of Louisiana
James H. McBurney, Northwestern University
D. W. Morris, Indiana State Teachers College
Karl Mundt, Congressman from South Dakota
Jennings Randolph, Congressman from West Virginia
Ruth Thomas, Public Schools, Passaic, New Jersey
Lester Thonssen, College of the City of New York
Karl R. Wallace, University of Virginia

COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION

Andrew T. Weaver, University of Wisconsin
H. L. Ewbank, University of Wisconsin
Robert West, University of Wisconsin

WAR PROBLEMS CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE, NEW YORK, 1943

Alabama	0	Nevada	0
Arizona	0	New Hampshire	2
Arkansas	0	New Jersey	24
California	2	New Mexico	0
Colorado	0	New York	184
Connecticut	10	North Carolina	2
Delaware	1	North Dakota	0
District of Columbia	4	Ohio	14
Florida	3	Oklahoma	1
Georgia	2	Oregon	1
Idaho	0	Pennsylvania	30
Illinois	11	Rhode Island	3
Indiana	4	South Carolina	2
Iowa	2	South Dakota	0
Kansas	2	Tennessee	1
Kentucky	0	Texas	1
Louisiana	4	Utah	1
Maine	3	Vermont	0
Maryland	7	Virginia	4
Massachusetts	5	Washington	0
Michigan	12	West Virginia	1
Minnesota	0	Wisconsin	5
Mississippi	0	Wyoming	0
Missouri	9	Canada	2
Montana	0		
Nebraska	0		359

IN THE PERIODICALS

DORIS G. YOAKAM, *Editor*

RHETORIC, PUBLIC ADDRESS, AND RADIO

BLOCH, JOSHUA, "Protestant and Jew," *The Protestant,* V (November, 1943), 16-25.

The text of a sermon delivered by Henry Ward Beecher at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, New York, on June 24, 1877, is presented by Reverend Bloch, in compiling and editing a series of sermons and papers by eminent Protestant churchmen. An introductory page is included which tells of the setting and conditions of the sermon and which comments on Beecher's attitude toward the Jews.

BUTLER, FRANK E., "Unique Radio Broadcast," *Radio News,* XXXI (January, 1944), 42-43, 92.

An example of radio's contribution to war economy is to be found in the wartime meeting of Norfolk and Western Railway employees, which was held over a radio hook-up of nineteen broadcasting stations located in six Southern States.

FULLER, CHARLES E., "Radio Evangelism," *Moody Monthly,* XLIV (January, 1944), 257-259, 300.

Reverend Fuller tells of his experience in broadcasting religious services and programs. Seventeen years ago his broadcast was limited to one local station. Today "The Old Fashioned Revival Hour," and "The Pilgrims' Hour," are released through 802 outlets.

GIELGUD, VAL, "British Broadcasting in War Time," *Theatre Arts,* XXVII (December, 1943), 708-714.

Wartime conditions have helped to develop and popularize some British radio programs, especially the broadcast play and the "feature programmes."

LEWIN, KURT, "The Dynamics of Group Action," *Educational Leadership,* I (January, 1944), 195-200.

Essential to a democratic commonwealth and educational system is an understanding of the various aspects of group dynamics.

PEARSON, LIONEL, "Three Notes on the Funeral Oration of Pericles," *American Journal of Philology,* LXIV (October, 1943), 399-407.

The speeches of Thucydides and Pericles have many characteristics in common. Aid in their interpretation is gained by contrasting the two.

ROOSEVELT, KERMIT, "Propaganda Techniques of the English Civil Wars—and the Propaganda Psychosis of Today," *The Pacific Historical Review,* XII (December, 1943), 369-379.

An examination of the role played by propaganda in past centuries is one of the best ways to correct the warped attitudes toward the propaganda of today.

STUDLEY, MARIAN H., "An 'August First' in 1844," *The New England Quarterly,* XVI (December, 1943), 567-577.

Abolition Picnics celebrating the liberation of slaves in the British West Indies gave many public speaking opportunities to propagandists of Anti-Slavery after 1842.

WALTER, L. ROHE, "Public Relations—In War and Peace," *United States Naval Institute Proceedings,* LXIX (December, 1943), 1577-1581.

The author, an economist on leave from the position of Advertising Manager and Director of Public Relations, the Flintkote Co., New York, to serve in the United States Naval Reserve, explains differences in the philosophy of commercial and wartime public relations activities. He stresses the importance of building public sentiment that is realistic because in this public opinion lies the hope of permanent peace.

WHITTON, JOHN B., "Radio After the War," *Foreign Affairs,* XXII (January, 1944), 309-317.

How can radio be harnessed to help in the colossal task of post-war occupation and world reconstruction? The use of radio as a medium for global understanding has great possibilities.

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION

ADAMS, ELISE HUNT, "A Night at the Chinese Theatre," *The Players Magazine*, XX (November, 1943), 6, 10, 16, 19.

The author describes the unique qualities of a New York Chinese Theatre production.

BENSON, ADOLPH B., "Charles XII on the American Stage," *Scandinavian Studies*, XVII (November, 1943), 290-296.

At least four Swedish rulers have appeared as primary dramatic characters on the American stage. This article tells especially of the numerous presentations of "Charles XII, or the Siege of Stralsund," a play which first appeared in New York City in 1829.

DE VRIES, PETER, "Poetry and the War," *College English*, V (December, 1943), 113-120.

What are the war poets writing? The author of this article attempts to answer this persistent literary question of the day.

FREEDLEY, GEORGE, "The Theatre Has Swallowed a Tapeworm," *National Theatre Conference Quarterly Bulletin*, V (November, 1943), 19-31.

The elaborate "folderol" to be overcome before a theatrical production can be presented is one of the unfortunate forces which is throttling the theatre of today.

GILBERT, GEORGE H., "Producing Royalty Plays," *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, XXVII (December, 1943), 77-79.

The "Royalty Project" of the National Theatre Conference is described in this article.

GIOVANNINI, G., "The Connection Between Tragedy and History in Ancient Criticism," *Philological Quarterly*, XXII (October, 1943), 308-314.

An intimate connection between poetry, especially tragic poetry, and history is thought to have been prevalent in ancient times.

ISAACS, EDITH J. R., "Lillian Hellman," *Theatre Arts*, XXVIII (January, 1944), 19-24.

Lillian Hellman has grown notably in stature as a playwright since the beginning of the war. Her techniques and skill are analyzed in this article.

LAVERNE, SISTER MARY, "Belascoism," *The Players Magazine*, XX (December, 1943), 6, 8, 17.

The contributions made to drama by David Belasco are reviewed in this article.

POUND, LOUISE, "The Future of Poetry," *College English*, V (January, 1944), 180-186.

The status of poetry has altered greatly during the present century.

ROWE, KENNETH, "Values for the War in Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, and The Tempest," *College English*, V (January, 1944), 207-213.

Shakespeare's plays may be analyzed in terms of today's happenings, and moral values found that give help to the needs of the human spirit.

SPER, FELIX, "Ghosts and Bricks," *The Players Magazine*, XX (December, 1943), 9, 14.

The regional drama of New York State offers interesting material for theatre productions.

STOKES, SEWELL, "Noel Coward," *Theatre Arts*, XXVIII (January, 1944), 29-39.

The author attempts to point out reasons for Coward's success as England's most famous stage personality.

TIMMONS, WILLIAM M., "Some Outcomes of Participation in Dramatics: I. Introduction and Attitude Toward the Play," *The Journal of Social Psychology*, XVIII (November, 1943), 315-330.

As the first of a series of two articles, this paper reports upon controlled experiments purposing to determine the value of dramatic participation to the individual.

TIMMONS, WILLIAM M., "The Influence of a Dramatic Production upon Audience Attitudes Toward the Play's Thesis," *The Journal of Social Psychology*, XVIII (November, 1943), 305-313.

Does the witnessing of a dramatic production change attitudes toward the underlying thesis of the play? The author presents results of an experiment attempting to determine audience reactions.

ZUCKER, A. E., "The Forgery in Ibsen's Doll's House," *Scandinavian Studies*, XVII (November, 1943), 309-312.

The author discusses and further analyzes Ibsen's writing techniques.

SPEECH SCIENCE

CAUGHEY, J. L., JR., "Analysis of Breathing Pattern," *The American Review of Tuberculosis*, XLVIII (December, 1943), 382-405.

Methods are presented in this article for making detailed analysis of breathing behavior recorded during routine basal metabolism tests. Results of the study of 700 spirograms are included.

DEXTER, GUY, "Audio-Frequency Meter," *Radio News*, XXX (December, 1943), 38-39, 78, 80, 82.

The author describes a laboratory instrument that incorporates many new refinements in an audio-frequency meter but retains the single adjustment control.

GIFFORD, D., "German 'Speech-on-Light' Signal System," *Radio*, No. 286 (November, 1943), 32-34, 72.

Apparatus which uses a light beam for voice communication is being used by the German Army to supplement radio equipment and field telephones.

HOOPER, STANFORD C., "Radio Production for the Armed Forces," *Proceedings of the I.R.E.*, XXXI (November, 1943), 640-642.

This article tells of the achievements made in the radio industry for meeting the needs of the Armed Forces.

MCCORMICK, ELSIE, "Your Throat," *Collier's*, CXII (December 4, 1943), 16, 52.

The mechanism of the human throat is described and suggestions for vocal care are given in this article.

PHONETICS AND SPEECH USAGE

BURTON, MARY, "The Hearing and Reading Comprehension of Vocabulary Among High-School Seniors," *The School Review*, LII (January, 1944), 47-50.

Statistics derived from a study of 175 subjects on the 12th grade level show that a significant difference exists between hearing comprehension and reading comprehension of vocabulary. Reading comprehension vocabulary forges ahead after fifth grade age.

CLOUGH, WILSON O., "Words are Symbols," *The Educational Forum*, VIII (January, 1944), 159-168.

The value of the tool known as language lies in the user, "his skill or ignorance, his integrity or lack of it, his mental flexibility or lack of it." Education can do no greater service than to instruct the young in the use of language, and "to show them how difficult, how full of pitfalls, and yet how altogether indispensable an instrument it is."

COENEN, FREDERIC EDWARD, "Phonetics and Standard German," *The German Quarterly*, XVI (November, 1943), 188-193.

An understanding of the formation of speech sounds is indispensable to the teacher of German, in spite of the arguments offered against the phonetic teaching of the language.

DAVIS, EDWIN B., "English Stress Accent," *College English*, V (December, 1943), 136-141.

Stress is an interesting factor in the problem of spelling and articulation. A device is proposed for developing stress consciousness.

FOLEY, LOUIS, "Mr. Churchill's 'Anglo-Saxon' Language," *The Journal of Education*, CXXVI (December, 1943), 284-285.

An analysis of the Latin, Anglo-Saxon and French influences found in the English language.

HALL, ROBERT A., JR., "The Vocabulary of Melanesian Pidgin English," *American Speech*, XVIII (October, 1943), 192-199.

The character and composition of Melanesian Pidgin English vocabulary are discussed.

KAPLAN, ABRAHAM, "Content Analysis and the Theory of Signs," *Philosophy of Science*, X (October, 1943), 230-247.

The influence of theories of language and meaning has made itself felt in almost every field of study in the last two decades. The author's purpose is to elucidate content analysis from the point of view of the general theory of signs.

KYTE, GEORGE C., "A Core Vocabulary for the Primary Grades," *The Elementary School Journal*, XLIV (November, 1943), 157-166.

A list of 100 words to be used for core reading and writing vocabularies in the early grades is presented.

MULDER, ARNOLD, "Noah Webster's Prophecy," *College English*, V (January, 1944), 196-200.

Our language is becoming increasingly American but in a manner different from that promulgated by Noah Webster.

NICHOLAS, WILLIAM H., "The World's Words," *The National Geographic Magazine*, LXXXIV (December, 1943), 689-700.

Consideration of topography is included in this explanation of the "mighty empires of speech."

NOYES, GERTRUDE E., "The First English Dictionary, Cawdrey's 'Table Alphabeticall,'" *Modern Language Notes*, LVIII (December, 1943), 600-605.

The author of this article discusses the origin of one of the first published dictionaries.

PAGET, R. A. S., "The Origin of Language," *Science*, XCIX (January 7, 1944), 14-15.

Questions are raised concerning a popular theory of the origin of speech.

REYNOLDS, PERRY and I. A. RICHARDS, "Basic English," *The Rotarian Magazine*, LXIII (December, 1943), 28-31, 56-57.

The advantages and disadvantages of Basic English are presented. Adaptation is not likely because of the "inherent refusal of Britons and Americans to be limited and restricted or regimented."

SPITZER, LEO, "Why Does Language Change?" *Modern Language Quarterly*, IV (December, 1943), 413-431.

The elements of consistency within the intricacies of language change allow for explanation of such changes.

WEBER, L. K., "850 Words to Unite World?" *Science Digest*, XIV (December, 1943), 1-3.

Basic English can be of aid in dissolving language barriers.

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH

ANONYMOUS, "Prevention and Treatment of the Common Cold," *Physician's Bulletin*, VIII (November-December, 1943), 172-175.

From a study covering a period of ten years it has been found that respiratory diseases cause forty per cent of all time lost on account of sickness. This article, appearing in the magazine issued by Eli Lilly and Company, stresses preventive precautions.

ANONYMOUS, "The Child with the Cleft Palate," *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, CXXIII (December 4, 1943), 906.

A brief review is given of the booklet on cleft palate issued for parents by the Department of Speech and the Institute for Human Adjustment of the University of Michigan.

BREMER, JOHN L., "The Diaphragm and Diaphragmatic Hernia," *Archives of Pathology*, XXXVI (December, 1943), 539-549.

Part I of this article details the embryological development of the diaphragm. Part II attempts to correlate this development with the various kinds of diaphragmatic hernia.

BURNET, F. M., "Upper Respiratory Tract Infection," *The Medical Journal of Australia*, II (November 13, 1943), 393-398.

Research must strive continually toward the goal of developing practicable methods of preventing influenza and related infections.

CAMPBELL, ANGUS A., "Cancer of the Larynx," *The Canadian Medical Association Journal*, XLIX (December, 1943), 509-512.

Observations on the characteristics of laryngeal cancer are offered, information being based upon a study of 103 cases.

COLLEDGE, LIONEL, "Deafness and Hardness of Hearing," *The Journal of The Royal Institute of Public Health and Hygiene*, VI (December, 1943), 305-310.

A description of hearing difficulties is offered to the layman by a physician. Vocal changes are mentioned.

DUNHAM, H. WARREN, "War and Mental Disorder: Some Sociological Considerations," *Social Forces*, XXII (December, 1943), 137-142.

The belief that war causes mental derangements has little scientific verification.

EGGSTON, ANDREW A., "Tumors of the Nose and Nasopharynx," *New York State Journal of Medicine*, XLIII (December 15, 1943), 2403-2412.

Practically every variety of tumor may at times be encountered in the region of the nose and throat. Many of them baffle proper diagnosis and classification.

FOSS, E. L., and G. B. NEW, "Traumatic Stenosis of the Larynx and Trachea: Report of Case," *Proceedings of the Staff Meetings of the Mayo Clinic*, XVIII (December 1, 1943), 472-476.

A twenty year old man was rendered unable to talk for eleven months because of a cicatricial stenosis of the larynx, caused by accident. He recovered from the injury, and his voice became "relatively good."

GATEWOOD, E. TRIBLE, "The Mechanism of Esophageal Voice Following Laryngectomy," *Virginia Medical Monthly*, LXXI (January, 1944), 9-13.

The laryngectomized patient has only one of the three important mechanisms required for speech production. Compensations must be made for the other two.

GRANT, WILLIAM T., "Brain Tumor with Parkinsonian Manifestations," *Bulletin of the Los Angeles Neurological Society*, VIII (December, 1943), 139-143.

A case of hemiparkinsonism due to a deep-seated left temporal lobe astrocytoma is reviewed.

HALL, R. L., "Mental Hygiene," *Texas State Journal of Medicine*, XXXIX (December, 1943), 426-428.

The care and handling of the mentally ill should be conducted along medical rather than legal lines.

HEERSEMA, PHILIP H., "Employment of Mental Hygiene Principles in Improved Selection of Armed Forces," *The Journal Lancet*, LXIII (December, 1943), 405-409.

A more effective screening program is needed to prevent individuals who are socially and mentally ill from joining the Armed Forces.

HELMHOLZ, HENRY F., "Emotional Disturbances of Children in Wartime," *Minnesota Medicine*, XXVI (December, 1943), 1044-1046.

There is no difference in the characteristics of children's emotional disturbances in wartimes and in peacetimes.

KRASNO, L. R., *et al.*, "The Use of the Stethoscope in the Prevention of 'Boilermakers' Laryngitis," *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, CXXIII (December 11, 1943), 958.

The stethoscope is an ideal instrument for use in combating industrial noises which cause undue strain on the voice. The speaker talks through the bell and the receiver listens through the ear pieces of the instrument.

RICHARDS, W. G., "War and Peace Neuroses," *The Journal Lancet*, LXIII (December, 1943), 398-402.

Mental states produced during war have their counterparts in civilian life and in times of peace. Only the tempo and intensity of the conditions are changed in war.

TREMBLE, G. EDWARD, "The Conservative Treatment of Sinusitis in Children," *The Canadian Medical Association Journal*, XLIX (December, 1943), 496-501.

The author stresses the belief that "every head cold should be regarded as potentially an acute sinusitis and treated as such." Early recognition of sinus involvement is important.

SPEECH PEDAGOGY

BENDER, JAMES F., "The Queens Speech and Hearing Center," *The Volta Review*, XLV (November, 1943), 613-615, 666, 668.

The author describes the organization and functioning of the speech improvement center at Queens College.

BERGER, EMMA VANDEWATER, "Basic Has a Word for Us," *The Volta Review*, XLVI (January, 1944), 25-27.

The Basic English vocabulary provides an

excellent instructional beginning for the teacher of hard of hearing adults and children.

BOOKBINDER, JACK, "Skills for Expressive Living," *Educational Leadership,* I (December, 1943), 148-151.

The author asks for a greater study and application of all of the expressive arts.

BRYSON, LYMAN, "The Study of Communication," *Teachers College Record,* XLV (November, 1943), 77-83.

Teachers of today need an increased understanding of the symbolic process of language.

COHLER, MILTON J., "The Uses and Abuses of Oral Reading," *The Elementary English Review,* XX (December, 1943), 327-329.

The values and functions of oral reading are delineated.

FREEMAN, FRANK N., "Left-Handed Handwriting," *The Educator,* XLIX (January, 1944), 12-13, 28-29.

The nature of handedness and its involvements is treated in this article.

FURSTENBERG, A. C., "The Otolaryngologist's Role in the Health Problems of American Youth," *Transactions American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology* (November-December, 1943), 57-58.

Speech reading, voice correction and vocational guidance are essential parts of the program for education of the hard of hearing which need developing.

GILLIS, HUGH W., "Achieving Better Speech in the Elementary Teacher," *Western Speech,* VII (November, 1943), 1-4.

San Jose State College, California, attempts to foster good speech habits throughout its teacher preparatory course.

GRAHAM, RAY, "Speech Correction . . . The Illinois Plan," *Educational Press Bulletin,* XXXIV (December, 1943), 11, 20-21.

The problem of speech defects in Illinois is discussed in this article, and included is an explanation of how the State is approaching the solution of the problem.

HATFIELD, W. WILBUR, "English for Men in Uniform," *College English,* V (January, 1944), 200-206.

A questionnaire was sent out asking for information concerning problems encountered by English teachers in the Army Specialized Training Program and in the Navy V-12. Results are presented.

HUCKLEBERRY, ALAN W., "The Speech Bureau: An Introduction," *The Teachers College Journal,* XV (November, 1943), 25-29.

The organization and activities of the Speech Bureau of the Speech Department at Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, are outlined in this article.

HUGGETT, A. J., "Training in College Teaching Methods," *Educational Administration and Supervision,* XXIX (November, 1943), 487-493.

So many young instructors are going directly into college teaching that it would be well to offer them special courses in college teaching techniques.

KLETZING, EVELYN, "Communicative Speech Through the Interpretation of Literature," *The English Journal,* XXXIII (January, 1944), 40-41.

Literature is the practice field for speech. Speech enables literature to "come alive."

LARSON, P. MERVILLE, "Speech Education, Your Challenge!" *Junior College Journal,* XIV (December, 1943), 163-165.

Should speech education in the junior college be allowed to become a war casualty?

MILLER, SOPHIE, "School Radio Programs," *School Activities,* XV (December, 1943), 129-130.

A radio entertainer, script writer and producer lists the types of school radio programs that listeners like.

MORGAN, JAMES C., "FM Radio in San Francisco's Schools," *The School Executive,* LXIII (December, 1943), 20-21.

San Francisco's public school radio is a pioneer in frequency modulation broadcasting and in education by means of radio.

NEILL, J. DONALD, "Basic Language in a Social Studies Class," *Social Education,* VIII (January, 1944), 17-18.

The author reports upon an experiment designed to change from a liability into an asset the differences in national and language backgrounds found within a classroom.

NELSON, BOYD E., "A Lip Reading Program for a School," *The Volta Review*, XLVI (January, 1944), 5-10, 56.

The Superintendent of the Utah School for the Deaf outlines a modern program for the education of the acoustically handicapped.

OSGOOD, CLARA, "Play Materials in the Home," *Public Health Nursing*, XXXV (December, 1943), 665-668.

Suggestions are offered for wise selection of toys for children. Age and need are two factors which require consideration.

MONTAGUE, HARRIET, "Lip Reading for Soldiers," *The Volta Review*, XLV (November, 1943), 640, 654, 656.

This article describes rehabilitation facilities for soldiers who return from the war with defective hearing.

PAYNE, CASSIE SPENCER, "Observation by Student Teachers," *The Elementary School Journal*, XLIV (December, 1943), 232-236.

A guide is offered to student teachers to help them benefit from their experiences in observing classroom teaching.

PITTS, CAROL M., "In Search of Tone," *Educational Music Magazine*, XXIII (November-December, 1943), 12-13, 48.

Emphasis is made by a choral singing teacher on the value of good breathing habits and good resonance.

RATHBONE, JOSEPHINE L., "Learning to Relax," *Teachers College Record*, XLV (November, 1943), 96-102.

The art of relaxation cannot be overemphasized in today's world. Benefits are to be found in teaching relaxation to groups.

RESEBURG, WALTER J., "Let's Give Them a Chance!" *The Clearing House*, XVIII (November, 1943), 140-144.

Students at Franklin High School, Seattle, Washington, share the floor with teachers and parents in discussing common problems.

ROTHBURG, BENJAMIN, "Dramatics for the Entire School," *The High School Thespian*, XV (December, 1943), 6-7.

There is a great need for correlating the activities of a Drama Department with the work of other departments in a school.

SANDVOS, ANNIS, "Putting Your Best Voice Forward," *Charm*, LIX (January, 1944), 61, 92-93.

Hints for self-training in speech improvement are offered to milady.

SCHOOLING, H. W., "The Discussion Group Project in Missouri," *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, XXVII (November, 1943), 86-87.

A report on the discussion group project in Missouri for the school year 1942-43 is outlined in this article.

SCHUELL, HILDRED, "Working with Speech Defectives in the Public Schools," *The Journal of Speech Disorders*, VIII (December, 1943), 355-362.

Suggestions are made by the author for facilitating the work of the speech correctionist in the public schools.

SHIBLER, HERMAN L., "Dramatics, Radio, and Public Speaking in Action," *The Clearing House*, XVIII (December, 1943), 213-216.

Radio, dramatics and public speaking offer channels for academic subjects to become functional parts of the pupils' everyday life at Highland Park, Michigan, High School.

WITTY, PAUL A., and SAMUEL GOLDBERG, "The Army's Training Program for Illiterate, Non-English Speaking, and Educationally Retarded Men," *The Elementary English Review*, XX (December, 1943), 306-311.

The principles, methods, and materials employed in the Special Training Unit Program are outlined in this article.

WRIGHT, CLARENCE N., "Teachers' Meetings Where People Learn," *International Journal of Religious Education*, XX (January, 1944), 8.

Faculty and departmental meetings can be made functional and interesting.

NEWS AND NOTES

RUTH P. KENTZLER, *Editor*

(Please send items of interest for this department directly to MISS KENTZLER, MADISON USO, MADISON, WISCONSIN.)

Mrs. Lucinda N. Bukeley, on leave from the University of Hawaii, will remain in New York City for the war duration. She is teaching adult education speech classes for New York University.

• • •

At least once a year, sometimes more often, the speech faculties in Columbia, Missouri, hold a get-together. The first in 1944 was held on January 23 with sixty-five people present from Christian College, Stephens College, University of Missouri, and the local schools. Dean. B. Lamar Johnson of Stephens College talked to the group on the prospect for postwar education. The meeting was held at the Stephens College Country Club.

• • •

The Louisiana State University Speech Clinic, under the direction of Claude E. Kantner, has expanded its facilities for handling cases. This year for the first time a fee of 50¢ per hour lesson is charged university students for training in the Clinic. Non-students are accepted for correction at a fee of $1.00 per lesson. The fee system is designed to pay about half of the instructional costs of the operation of the Clinic. Max Reed, formerly of the Reed Institute for Speech Correction in New Orleans, Mrs. Helen Seip, and Eugene E. White of the Department of Speech, are serving as assistants in the Speech Clinic. The Clinic is expanding its work with children from the surrounding area and working in close cooperation with the Testing Bureau at the University.

The Demonstration School at Louisiana State University has also employed for the first time an assistant in charge of Speech Correction work. Miss Betty Shepherd, formerly of Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana, is in charge of the Demonstration School Clinic under the direction of Dallas Williams, Instructor in Speech in the College of Education.

Clifford Anne King Norton, on leave of absence from Louisiana State, is spending the year with her husband, Lieutenant Leslie Norton, who is stationed in Washington, D.C. Her place is filled by Carolyn Vance, who has been granted a year's leave of absence from the University of Georgia.

• • •

Nora Landmark, formerly of Alabama College, is now acting Radio Program Director and Instructor in Speech at Louisiana State. She replaces Charlotte Searles, who has resigned to become recreational director for the American Red Cross. Miss Searles is stationed at Langley Field, Virginia.

• • •

Ethel Theodora Rockwell, formerly of the University of Wisconsin, is now Director of the Bureau of Dramatic Activities in the General Extension Division of Louisiana State University.

• • •

The new Technical Director of the Louisiana State University Theatre is Archibald McLeod, formerly of Texas College for Women. He will also teach courses in dramatics. Professor McLeod holds the doctor's degree from Cornell University.

• • •

Mrs. Louise S. Perry, formerly of Greensboro College, is now Assistant Professor of Speech in Delta College, Cleveland, Mississippi.

• • •

T. O. Andrus is Instructor of Speech in the University of Minnesota. He is teaching courses in design, stagecraft, and lighting, and will have charge of the scenery for the six major dramatic productions.

• • •

Burrell F. Hansen is doing part-time teaching and pursuing work toward his doctorate in the University of Minnesota rather than Missouri as was reported in a previous issue of News and Notes.

The Department of Drama at Yale has invited the citizens of New Haven to participate in a major production. On March 16, 17, and 18 the New Haveners took part in Thornton Wilder's *Our Town*. Formerly the department had been associated with local amateur groups in conducting a play tournament each spring, but because these groups had to cease activities during the war, the department is now offering the community the opportunity of acting in one of its major productions.

Edward C. Reveaux had charge of casting and directing. Formerly he was director of the Community Theatre of Tucson, Arizona. Acting Chairman of the Department of Drama is Walter Prichard Eaton.

• • •

Arthur E. Secord, University of Missouri, became a member of the Department of Speech in Brooklyn College on February 1.

• • •

George F. Rassweiler of Beloit College is retiring and his place is being taken by K. E. Montgomery. Professor Montgomery is a graduate of Carroll College and had done graduate work in Northwestern University.

• • •

Margaret Baum is now Director of Dramatics at Carroll College. She is taking the position vacated by Francis Hodge, who is now in the Army.

• • •

Mrs. Rowland L. Lee, Jr., the former Ruth Pirtle, Head of the Department of Speech in Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas, from 1925 to 1941 is now living at 413 Broad Street, La Grange, Georgia. Mr. Lee is Dean of Education in Callaway Institute in La Grange.

• • •

Florence M. Henderson, Associate Professor of Speech in the University of Hawaii from 1937 to 1943, is now on the Speech Clinic of the University of Illinois.

• • •

Ensign J. Jeffery Auer, on leave from Oberlin, is now stationed at Hollywood, Florida.

• • •

Governor John W. Bricker of Ohio is another of the growing list of men in public life who received training in a college department of speech. In Ohio State University, Governor Bricker was a student in the classes of Professor V. A. Ketcham and for two years was captain of the debate team. "Bricker was so promising that upon his graduation I offered him a job as an instructor in the department," Professor Ketcham relates; but Bricker refused the teaching post because of a preference for public life.

• • •

Ruth Elizabeth Reber, formerly of Wayland Junior College, is now Director of the Department of Speech in Milwaukee-Downer College and is teaching dramatic literature, interpretation, and in interpretation.

• • •

Elizabeth Cole, formerly of Syracuse University, is teaching the beginning speech courses and directing plays in Milwaukee-Downer College.

• • •

Michael Cisney, director of the Little Theatre of Jacksonville, Florida, was one of the first group of officers commissioned as theatrical specialists in the Army Special Service Division. His Army cognomen is First Lieutenant Edwin J. Smith. For almost a year he was in charge of all theatrical recreation in the South Pacific area. His all-soldier revue, entitled *The South Sea Island Scandals*, was featured as a pictorial in *Life;* and the July issue of *Theatre Arts* carried an account of his activities. He also was assigned to escort Joe E. Brown, Gary Cooper, and Randolph Scott on their Pacific tours. After setting up staffs to carry on recreation programs in seven Pacific bases, he is now somewhere in New Guinea, in recently captured territory, running the new service men's radio station that he helped design and build. In designing it he did not fail to add a "nice, roomy, foxopolis for sheltering in on moonlit nights." He is now launching a program of shows and portable travelling units for outlying areas.

• • •

The Western Association of Teachers of Speech is holding three divisional conventions this year. The Eastern Divisional Convention was combined with the Rocky Mountain Speech Conference and held in Denver, February 15-17, under the direction of Elwood Murray, University of Denver. The Northwest Divisional Convention was held in Salem, Oregon, March 13-17, with the President of the Western Association, Earl W. Wells, Oregon State College, presiding. The Southwest Divisional Convention, under the direction of J. H. Baccus, University of Redlands, will be held in Los Angeles during April.

AMONG THE CONTRIBUTORS

LIONEL CROCKER, *Editor*

Lennox Grey: *Toward Better Communication in 1944 . . .* (Ph.B., Ph.D., Chicago), head of the Department of the Teaching of English and Foreign Languages in Teachers College, Columbia University, is editing a series of pamphlets on *Communication, War, and Reconstruction* for the National Council of Teachers of English and is the author of *What Communication Means Today*, the introductory pamphlet of the series.

John T. Williams: *The Television Outlook* (New Mexico Military Institute; Milligan) is Manager of the Television Department, National Broadcasting Company and also secretary to the RCA and NBC Television Committees.

Ross Scanlan: *Television and Departments of Speech* (A.B., Cornell; M.A., Pittsburgh; Ph.D., Cornell), Assistant Professor of Public Speaking in the City College of New York, was from July, 1942, to December, 1943, one of the broadcasters in Station WNBT's series of weekly television lectures for the New York City Air Warden Service.

Robert West: *The Prospect for Speech Education* (Ph.D., Wisconsin) is the immediate Past President of the ASSOCIATION and is also Past President of the American Speech Correction Association. He is Professor of Speech Pathology in the University of Wisconsin, and is the author of three texts in the fields of public speaking, speech rehabilitation, and phonetics.

Major Harold W. Kent: *The Army and Its Needs in Speech* (B.S., M.S., Northwestern) is director of the Radio Council-Station WBEZ of the Chicago Public Schols, is President of the Association for Education by Radio, and is Executive Chairman of the School Broadcast Conference. At present he is on leave and serving as War Department liaison to the U. S. Office of Education.

Captain William West: *Speech and the Signal Corps* (B.S. in E.E., New York University) is an instructor in the Eastern Signal Corps Schools, Ft. Monmouth, N.J., and is currently a student at the Army's Command and General Staff School. Captain West was engaged in the electrical engineering profession prior to being ordered from reserve status to active duty in 1941.

Walter B. Emery: *Verbal Warfare* (A.B., Oklahoma Baptist University; LL.B., Oklahoma; Ph.D., Wisconsin), Assistant Professor of Speech in Ohio State University and Director of the Ohio Speech League, is now on leave serving as Assistant to Paul A. Walker, Member, Federal Communications Commission. He was a contributor to the *History and Criticism of American Public Address* and is preparing a study in the field of politics and public opinion.

Kenneth G. Hance: *Public Address in a Democracy at War* (A.B., Olivet; Ph.D., Michigan). Assistant Professor of Speech in the University of Michigan, is coauthor (with James McBurney) of *The Principles and Methods of Discussion,* and is the author of articles in the field of public address.

Wilbur E. Moore: *Samuel Johnson on Rhetoric* (A.B., Missouri Wesleyan; M.A., Ph.D., Iowa) is Chairman of the Department of Spech in Central Michigan College. He has published articles on speech correction, semantics, and mental hygiene.

Ora B. DeVilbiss Davisson: *The Early Pamphlets of Alexander Hamilton* (B.S. in Ed., M.A., Missouri) is a speech correctionist in the public schools of Ann Arbor, Michigan. From 1939-43 she was an Instructor in Speech and Assistant Director of the Speech Clinic in the University of Missouri. Her work toward the doctorate has been done in the University of Michigan.

Elaine E. McDavitt: *Susan B. Anthony, Reformer and Speaker* (B.S., M.A., Northwestern) is the Thomas C. Trueblood Fellow at the University of Michigan where she is working for the doctorate. She is on leave of absence from the Liggett School, Detroit, Michigan, where she has been director of speech and dramatic activities for the past six years.

Howard Gilkinson: *Experimental and Statistical Research in General Speech* (M.A., Iowa; Ph.D., Minnesota) has charge of the fundamentals course and military speech instruction in the University of Minnesota. He

also teaches courses in pedagogy and directs graduate research. His *Outlines of Research in General Speech* was published recently by Burgess Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Howard W. Townsend: *Factors of Influence in Radio Speech* (B.S., M.A., Texas), Instructor in Speech at the University of Texas, is a frequent contributor to *The Texas Outlook*, and has previously published one article, "The Psychological Aspects of Radio Speech," in the JOURNAL. He is pursuing graduate work at Wisconsin.

William G. Hardy: *The Philosophy of Modern Semantics* (Ph.B., Brown; M.A., New York University; Ph.D., Cornell), Instructor in English at the New York State College for Teachers, has previously taught at Brown and Cornell. He has written various articles on phonetics, debating, and the teaching of speech. At present he is conducting a phonetic analysis of the Hudson River Valley, and is assembling material for a book on semantics.

Forrest H. Rose: *Two and Two Make What?* (A.B., M.A., Ohio Wesleyan; Ph.D., Wisconsin), Chairman of the Department of Speech, Southeast Missouri State Teachers College, Cape Girardeau, Missouri, is Past National President of Pi Kappa Delta. He was on leave for a portion of last year, and was with the Speakers Section of the Office of Civilian Defense.

Lieut. A. B. Pomerantz: *Miss Anderson's Critique of General Semantics* (A.B., New York University; M.A., Wisconsin) was working on his Ph.D. dissertation in Wisconsin and teaching in Brooklyn College at the time of his induction into the army in 1941. He is now serving in North Africa as a Personnel Consultant in the Adjutant General's Department.

Edward L. Thorndike: *Euphony and Cacophony Words and Sounds* (A.B., Wesleyan; Ph.D., Columbia; Sc.D. Wesleyan, Chicago; LL.D., Iowa, Harvard, Edinburgh) is Emeritus Professor of Education in Teachers College, Columbia University. He has recently done special research in the psychology of language, reported in two monographs: *Studies in the Psychology of Language*, 1938, and *The Teaching of English Suffixes*, 1942. He is also the author of the *Thorndike Century Junior Dictionary*, 1935, and the *Thorndike Century Senior Dictionary*, 1941.

John Dolman, Jr.: *Escapist Theatre in Wartime* (B.S., M.A., Pennsylvania), Professor of English and Director of the Summer School in the University of Pennsylvania, is a Past President of the National Association of Teachers of Speech and Past Editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH. He is the author of *A Handbook of Public Speaking* and *The Art of Play Production*. He has also been active for many years in community theater work in Swarthmore, Pa., and is a member of the National Theatre Conference.

Louis M. Eich: *The American Indian Plays* (Ph.D., Michigan), Associate Professor of Speech in the University of Michigan, is the author of a number of articles published in the JOURNAL in the fields of interpretation and in theatre history. He was a member of the Editorial Board and a contributor to the *History and Criticism of American Public Address*.

Edward Burt Longerich: *The Junior-High-School Speech Teacher* (A.B., Iowa; M.S., Butler) and Mary Coates-Longerich (A.B., Akron; M.A., Wisconsin; Ph.D., Louisiana) formerly were serving as speech instructors at the northeast center of Louisiana State University. For the duration Mr. Longerich is connected with the process Engineering Department, Douglas Aircraft, Long Beach, California. Dr. Mary Longerich is engaged in the private practice of speech pathology in Hollywood.

Virgil A. Anderson: *Speech Needs and Abilities of Prospective Teachers* (A.B., Willamette; M.A., Stanford; Ph.D., Wisconsin), Associate Professor of Speech and Drama in Stanford University and Director of Speech Re-education, is an Associate Editor of *Speech Monographs*. His book, *Training the Speaking Voice*, was published in 1942.

Karl F. Robinson: *Training the Secondary-School Teacher of Speech*, Head of Speech in the University High School at the State University of Iowa, is the author of numerous articles on group discussion, courses of study, and on methods of teaching speech. As chairman of the Secondary School Committee of the NATS, he organized and maintains the Service Division for high-school teachers; recently he sponsored the publication in the JOURNAL of the series of eight articles on procedures for teaching speech in secondary schools.